

ROSE]. I am informed that upon this particular proposition he would vote "nay." I therefore feel at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. WOLCOTT (when his name was called). I transfer my general pair with the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WARSON] to the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] and vote "yea."

Mr. THOMAS. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER]. I am informed that if he were present he would vote in the negative. I therefore feel at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. FLETCHER (after having voted in the affirmative). I find that my pair, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BALL], is not present and has not voted. I transfer my pair to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] and let my vote stand.

Mr. HENDERSON. Has the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK] voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not.

Mr. HENDERSON (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Illinois, and in his absence I withdraw my vote.

Mr. MYERS. Has the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He has not.

Mr. MYERS. I have a pair with the Senator from Connecticut, which I transfer to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] and vote "yea."

Mr. LODGE. I have a general pair with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] has a pair with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM]. By arrangement we transfer our pairs, and we are both at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM]. I transfer my pair to the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. GOODING] and vote "nay."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS). The Chair desires to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN].

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX] with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN].

Mr. HARRISON. I wish to announce the absence of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] on account of illness. As has been stated, he is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX].

I also desire to announce that if the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], who is temporarily absent on official business of the Senate, were present and at liberty to vote, he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 29, as follows:

YEAS—25.

Ashurst	Harrison	Ransdell	Trammell
Capper	Heflin	Reed	Underwood
Dial	Kirby	Robinson	Walsh, Mont.
Fletcher	La Follette	Sheppard	Wolcott
France	Myers	Simmons	
Gay	Phelan	Swanson	
Harris	Pittman	Townsend	

NAYS—29.

Curtis	Kendrick	New	Thomas
Elkins	Kenyon	Overman	Wadsworth
Glass	Keyes	Poindexter	Warren
Gronna	Lenroot	Smith, Md.	Williams
Hale	Lodge	Smoot	Willis
Jones, N. Mex.	McNary	Spencer	
Jones, Wash.	Moses	Sterling	
Kellogg	Nelson	Sutherland	

NOT VOTING—42.

Ball	Fall	Knox	Pomerene
Beckham	Fernald	McCormick	Sherman
Borah	Frelinghuysen	McCumber	Shields
Brandeggee	Gerry	McKellar	Smith, Ariz.
Calder	Gooding	McLean	Smith, Ga.
Chamberlain	Gore	Newberry	Smith, S. C.
Colt	Henderson	Norris	Stanley
Culbertson	Hitchcock	Owen	Walsh, Mass.
Cummins	Johnson, Calif.	Page	Watson
Dillingham	Johnson, S. Dak.	Penrose	
Edge	King	Phipps	

So Mr. ROBINSON's amendment to the amendment of the committee was rejected.

RECESS.

Mr. WARREN. I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Tuesday, February 8, 1921, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, February 7, 1921.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., pastor of Calvary Methodist Episcopal Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

God Almighty, be good unto us to-day and bless us, and cause Thy face to shine upon us. May we hearken unto the call of duty. Revive in us our best energies and rekindle upon the hearthstones of our hearts a holy passion for the love of our country. Clothe us with cleanliness, and reveal unto us the glory of hidden purity, and at evening time may we be found seeking only an honorable rest. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, February 5, 1921, and of Sunday, February 6, 1921, was read and approved.

CALL OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. It is clear that there is no quorum present.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Andrews, Md.	Ferris	Kreider	Randall, Calif.
Ashbrook	Focht	Leshner	Reed, W. Va.
Babka	French	Loneragan	Riordan
Baer	Gallagher	Lufkin	Robinson, N. C.
Bee	Gandy	McCulloch	Rubey
Bell	Ganly	McDuffie	Sabath
Benson	Gard	McGlennon	Sanders, Ind.
Blackmon	Garrett	McKiniry	Sanders, La.
Bland, Mo.	Goldfogle	McLane	Sanders, N. Y.
Bowers	Goodall	Maher	Sanford
Britten	Goodwin, Ark.	Mann, S. C.	Scully
Burke	Gould	Mays	Small
Butler	Graham, Pa.	Moon	Smith, N. Y.
Candler	Greene, Vt.	Mooney	Smithwick
Cantrill	Hamill	Mudd	Steele
Carew	Harrison	Neely	Stephens, Miss.
Carss	Haugen	Nelson, Wis.	Stiness
Cassey	Hersman	Nolan	Sullivan
Chindblom	Hicks	O'Connor	Tague
Clark, Fla.	Hoe	Oliver	Townner
Classon	Hulings	Overstreet	Venable
Coady	Humphreys	Padgett	Walters
Costello	Hutchinson	Patterson	Watkins
Currie, Mich.	James, Mich.	Perlman	Whaley
Davey	Johnson, Ky.	Peters	Wilson, Ill.
Dent	Kahn	Phelan	Wilson, Pa.
Doelling	Kennedy, Iowa	Radcliffe	Wise
Eagle	Kettner	Rainey, Ala.	Yates
Edmonds	Kincheloe	Rainey, Henry T.	
Ellsworth	Kitchin	Rainey, John W.	
Emerson	Kraus	Ramsey	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and eight Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming moves to dispense with further proceedings under the call. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will open the doors.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 4879. An act to amend section 1 of the act of Congress approved March 2, 1895 (28 Stats. L., p. 907), and to extend restrictions against alienation of lands allotted to and inherited by certain Quapaw Indians, and for other purposes; and

S. 4886. An act to extend the time of the Hudson River Connecting Railroad Corporation for the completion of its bridge across the Hudson River, in the State of New York.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below:

S. 4924. An act to retrocede to the State of Virginia exclusive jurisdiction heretofore acquired by the United States of America

over the property and persons of the town site or territory known as United States Housing Corporation project 150A, located in Norfolk County, State of Virginia, and called Cradock; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

S. 2682. An act for the relief of Blanche Winters; to the Committee on War Claims.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H. R. 8881. An act for the relief of the First National Bank, of New Carlisle, Ind.

SUSPENSION DAY—CALENDAR FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

The SPEAKER. To-day is suspension day. The Clerk will call the Calendar for Unanimous Consent.

JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF ALASKA.

The first business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 4205) to amend section 4, chapter 1 of Title I of an act entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1900, as heretofore amended by section 2 of an act entitled "An act to amend section 86 of an act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii, to provide for additional judges, and for other judicial purposes," approved March 3, 1909, and for other purposes.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. WALSH. I ask that the bill be reported. We could not hear its purport from the reading of the title.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The text of the bill was read.

Mr. BLANTON. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I will reserve it for a moment in order to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. VOLSTEAD rose.

Mr. BLANTON. There are how many people in Alaska?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Fifty thousand.

Mr. BLANTON. Are we providing in this bill four Federal District judges for 50,000 people?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. No. We already have the judges. This is a rearrangement of the boundaries, in the effort to better handle the public business. The gentleman will remember that practically 98 per cent of all Alaska is Federal domain. This bill does not increase the number of judges. It merely changes the boundaries of the districts.

Mr. BLANTON. The four judges are already there?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. I do not want to get rid of them. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what are the changes proposed? What is the necessity for them?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I want to say this: The judges up there have agreed to this proposition, and the Attorney General has recommended it, and there is no opposition to it. Mr. GRASBY, the Delegate, is in favor of it. It is all a matter of unanimous consent.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, it is impossible to hear anything. I ask the gentleman what is the reason for it, and what is the necessity?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. The trouble is that in some sections now it is almost impossible to reach the courts, and the object is to make it possible for the people in the Territory to reach the courts more conveniently. This legislation has the general agreement of the people up there, has the approval of the judges, the Attorney General, and the Delegate from Alaska, and, so far as I know, there is no one opposing it.

Mr. WINGO. Well, with great respect for the gentleman's conclusion, what I wanted is the basis for his arrival at his conclusion. What is the basis of it which caused him to reach the conclusion?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. In the bill the boundaries of the four judicial districts are based on the centers of population. The bill indicates the four centers of population.

Mr. WINGO. Has there been some sudden change in the last few months?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The boundary lines made many years ago were found in the course of practice to be not quite desirable, transportation being very bad.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. There is no communication by boat or otherwise as to some of the territory now in the various divisions, and it is for the purpose of making it easier for them to reach those various divisions.

Mr. WINGO. Was there communication by boat at the time the present boundaries were fixed?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Very slow. I have seen marshals, witnesses, prisoners, and all going perhaps 350 miles by boat to get to court. The judges in Alaska agree that the boundaries fixed in this bill, which has passed the Senate, are more desirable, and the provisions in this bill are recommended by the Attorney General.

Mr. WINGO. Does the gentleman say that the only change is to rearrange the boundaries of the divisions?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Quite so.

Mr. WINGO. How many divisions have they?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Four districts.

Mr. WINGO. How many divisions?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I could not say.

Mr. WINGO. At how many places do they hold court?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Four places.

Mr. WINGO. One place in each district?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. As I understand it, at one place in each district and at the capital. I think in the first district, in southeastern Alaska, they hold court at Juneau, according to this bill, and somewhere else.

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VOLSTEAD] assure the House that the only change provided for in this bill is the rearranging of the lines of the districts?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. As recommended by the Attorney General.

Mr. WINGO. As recommended by the judges and by the Department of Justice, and no other changes are provided?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. No other changes are provided.

Mr. WINGO. I withdraw my reservation.

Mr. MCCLINTIC. Reserving the right to object, I wish to ask why this bill appropriates \$7,500 a year for each of these four judges, if they are already provided for by law?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. This is simply a reenactment of the statute, and, of course, in changing the statute we reenacted the portions which were unchanged.

Mr. MCCLINTIC. I notice on page 5 it authorizes the court to employ interpreters and stenographers, and leaves it to the Attorney General to pay their salaries. What I should like to know is, is there not some provision of law at the present time that specifies the salary to be paid to interpreters and to court stenographers?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. This is the law as it is on the statute book now. It simply repeats the old law in that respect.

Mr. MCCLINTIC. In other words, they already have that right? The Attorney General was given that right heretofore?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. That is my understanding, that there is no change in the law except in the boundaries of the districts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of chapter 1 of Title I of the act entitled "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes," approved June 6, 1900, as amended by section 2 of an act entitled "An act to amend section 86 of an act to provide a government for the Territory of Hawaii, to provide for additional judges, and for other judicial purposes," approved March 3, 1909, which section also constitutes section 383 of the Compiled Statutes of the Territory of Alaska, 1913, be, and the same hereby is, further amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 383. There is hereby established a district court for the District of Alaska, with the jurisdiction of district courts of the United States and with general jurisdiction in civil, criminal, equity, and admiralty causes; and four district judges shall be appointed for the district, each at an annual salary of \$7,500, who shall during their terms of office reside in the divisions of the district to which they may be respectively assigned by the President. The court shall consist of four divisions, which shall also be recording divisions.

"Division No. 1 shall consist of all that part of the District of Alaska lying east of the one hundred and forty-first meridian of west longitude.

"Division No. 2 shall consist of all that territory lying west of a line commencing on the Arctic coast at the one hundred and forty-eighth meridian; thence extending south along the easterly watershed of the Colville River to a point on the Rocky Mountain divide between the headwaters of Colville River on the north and west and the waters of the Chandler River on the south; thence southwesterly along the divide between the waters of the Colville River, Kotzebue Sound, and Norton Sound on the north and west and the waters of the Yukon on the south to the one hundred and sixty-first meridian of west longitude; thence along said meridian to a point on the summit of the divide between the Yukon and Kuskokwim Rivers; thence extending easterly along the divide between the waters of the Yukon, Iditarod, and Innoko Rivers on the north and the waters of the Kuskokwim River on the south, to the summit of Mount McKinley; thence southwesterly along the divide between the waters of the Kuskokwim River and Bay on the north and west and the Gulf of Alaska and Bristol Bay on the south,

to the westerly point of Cape Newenham; the said division to include all the islands lying along and off the coast of this division, between Cape Newenham and the point where the one hundred and forty-eighth meridian, west longitude, intersects the northern line of the Territory."

With the following committee amendment:

Amend, on page 3, line 5, after the word "point," by striking out the remainder of that line and all of the language down to and including the word "Territory," in line 18, and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Midway between the Yukon River and the Kuskokwim River, thence southwesterly to the point of intersection of the sixty-first parallel of north latitude with the shore of Bering Sea; the said division to include all the islands lying north of the fifty-eighth parallel of north latitude and west of the one hundred and forty-eighth meridian of west longitude, excepting Nelson Island, all islands in Kuskokwim Bay, all islands in Bristol Bay, and all islands in the Gulf of Alaska north of the fifty-eighth parallel of north latitude."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, there was so much confusion I could not understand the reading of the amendment. Does it simply change the boundaries?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. It changes the boundaries. It was discovered after the bill passed the Senate that there was a mistake in the boundaries given.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Division No. 3 shall consist of all that territory lying south and west of the line starting on the coast of the Gulf of Alaska at the one hundred and forty-first meridian of west longitude; thence northerly along said meridian to a point due east from Mount Kimball; thence west to the summit of Mount Kimball; thence southwesterly along the southerly watershed of the headwaters of Tanana River; thence westerly along the divide between the waters of the Gulf of Alaska on the south and the waters of the Yukon on the north to the summit of Mount McKinley; thence continuing southwesterly along the divide between the waters of the Kuskokwim River and Bay on the north and west and the Gulf of Alaska and Bristol Bay on the south to the westerly point of Cape Newenham; the said division to include the Alaska Peninsula, the Aleutian and Pribilof Islands, and all islands along and off the coast of this division, between Cape Newenham and the point where the one hundred and forty-first meridian, west longitude, intersects the northern line of the territory.

Division No. 4 shall consist of that part of the District of Alaska lying east of the second division and north of the third division, and all islands along the north coast of said division east of the one hundred and forty-eighth meridian of west longitude.

With the following committee amendment:

Amend by striking out the period in line 17, page 4, and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "also the Nelson Islands and all islands in Kuskokwim Bay."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

One general term of court shall be held each year at Juneau, and such additional terms at other places in the first division as the Attorney General may direct. One general term of court shall be held each year at Nome, and such additional terms at other places in the second division as the Attorney General may direct. One general term of court shall be held each year at Valdez, and such additional terms at other places in the third division as the Attorney General may direct. One general term of court shall be held each year at Fairbanks, and such additional terms at other places in the fourth division as the Attorney General may direct. Each of the judges is authorized and directed to hold such special terms of court as may be necessary for the public welfare or for the dispatch of the business of the court at such times and places in their respective districts as any of them, respectively, may deem expedient, or as the Attorney General may direct; and each shall have authority to employ interpreters and to make allowances for the necessary expenses of his court and to employ an official court stenographer at such compensation as shall be fixed by the Attorney General. At least 30 days' notice shall be given by the judge, or the clerk, of the time and place of holding the several terms of the court.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I notice that it speaks of divisions. Are the districts divided into divisions or do you refer to the districts as divisions?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I will show the gentleman a map showing the various divisions.

Mr. WINGO. The point I am asking about is this: Is Alaska simply divided into divisions and not into districts?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. I think it is. I am not prepared to say as to that.

Mr. WINGO. I was under the impression that ordinarily a division means a part of a district, the court being held in each division, though all may be in the same district.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. That may be true.

Mr. WINGO. And yet I notice the description here is of divisions; but you do not have any boundaries of districts.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. There is only one district—the district of Alaska.

Mr. WINGO. They have just made Alaska one district with four judges?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. And then they make different subdivisions just like they subdivide the districts on the continent?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill as amended was ordered to a third reading, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. VOLSTEAD, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

MEDICAL, SURGICAL, AND HOSPITAL SERVICES AND SUPPLIES.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass, with the amendments incorporated therein, the bill which I send to the Clerk's desk.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I thought the Chair was going to recognize me.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize the gentleman later. The gentleman moves to suspend the rules and pass a bill with amendments, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the bill (H. R. 15894) to authorize an appropriation to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to provide medical, surgical, and hospital services and supplies for persons who served in the World War and are patients of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance and of the Federal Board for Vocational Education, Division of Rehabilitation, and for other purposes, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to provide additional hospital and out-patient dispensary facilities for persons who served in the World War and are patients of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance and of the Federal Board for Vocational Education, Division of Rehabilitation, (1) by purchase, gift, or lease of existing plants, (2) by construction on sites now owned by the Government or on sites acquired by purchase, condemnation, gift, or otherwise, or (3) by such remodeling or extension of existing plants and their equipment, owned or acquired by the United States, as may be necessary economically to adapt such plants to the uses and purposes herein provided, such hospitals and out-patient dispensary facilities to include the necessary buildings with their appropriate mechanical equipment and approach work, including roads and trackage facilities leading thereto; for the accommodation of patients, officers, nurses, and attending personnel, and for storage, laundries, vehicles, and live stock, and including necessary furniture, equipment, and accessories, and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to accept gifts or donations for any of the purposes named in this act.

Sec. 2. That the authorization of expenditures hereinafter made shall include and provide for five hospital plants of fireproof construction for the treatment of neuro-psychiatric and tuberculosis patients and shall be located as follows: One in the Central Atlantic Coast States, one in the region of the Great Lakes, one in the Central Southwestern States, one in the Rocky Mountain States, and one in southern California: *Provided*, That all of said hospital locations shall be as convenient as practicable for transportation facilities and for securing expert consulting service.

Sec. 3. That the Secretary of the Treasury, in securing sites herein provided for, may request the Secretary of any other department of the Government to transfer to the Treasury Department such lands or lands and buildings under his control, not required for other purposes, as the Secretary of the Treasury may deem suitable, and other departments are authorized to make such transfers to the Treasury Department as may be deemed to be in the interest of the Government.

Sec. 4. That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to take over immediately Fort Mackenzie, Wyo., and Fort Walla Walla, Wash., with all lands, buildings, and equipment belonging thereto, for the uses contemplated by this act, and to make such alterations, additions, and repairs to the same as may be necessary, and the Secretary of War is directed to turn over said properties to the Secretary of the Treasury for said uses and purposes.

Sec. 5. That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to employ for service within or without the District of Columbia, without regard to civil-service laws, rules, and regulations, and to pay from the sums hereinafter authorized for construction purposes, at customary rates of compensation, exclusively to aid in the preparation of the plans and specifications for the above-named objects and for the supervision of the execution thereof, for traveling expenses, field-office equipment, and supplies, commercial printing in or out of the District of Columbia, incident thereto, at a total limit of cost for such additional technical and clerical services and traveling expenses, etc., of not exceeding 3 per cent of the limit of cost for construction: *Provided*, That all of the above-mentioned work shall be under the direction and supervision of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Sec. 6. That the foregoing hospitals and other facilities shall be available for veterans of the War with Spain, the Philippine Insurrection, and the Boxer rebellion suffering from neuro-psychiatric and tubercular ailments and diseases.

Sec. 7. That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the purposes herein provided the sum of \$2,500,000 for each of the five plants provided for in section 2, and the total sum of \$500,000 for the two forts mentioned in section 4.

Sec. 8. That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to enter into an agreement with the commission for military hospital of the State of New York, pursuant to the provisions of chapter 958 of the Laws of 1920, State of New York, to lease and thereafter to lease, in accordance with the provisions of said act, subject to appropriation by the Congress of the United States, the hospital to be known as the New York Military Hospital to be constructed by said commission, when said hospital shall have been completed and ready for occupancy.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. RUCKER. I demand a second.

Mr. LANGLEY. I ask unanimous consent that a second may be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky has 20 minutes and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER] has 20 minutes.

Mr. LANGLEY. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

Mr. McCLINTIC. I object.

Mr. LANGLEY. I ask the Speaker to kindly advise me when I have used five minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I shall detain the House for only a few moments, and I trust, in view of the condition of my voice and of the fact that I have promised to yield to other gentlemen the larger portion of the brief time permissible for debate under the rules, that my colleagues will interrupt me as little as possible. Since there are several angles to this proposition, and because of the widespread interest in and discussion of it, which has included some criticism, I have done what I have not usually done in the minor part which I have taken in the discussions in this body—I have reduced my remarks to writing.

It is not my purpose, Mr. Speaker, to indulge in any criticism of anybody in or out of Congress, but I desire to state that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, of which I have the honor to be the chairman, is not in any way responsible for the delay in providing proper hospital service for our disabled ex-service men. The record will show that quite the contrary is true and that the blame for whatever delay that may have occurred can not be laid at its door. We were prepared, after extensive hearings, to report early in the last session a hospital bill which it was believed would meet the immediate exigencies of the situation at that time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi, but I hope he will make his question very brief.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. I notice that the South is not provided for at all in this bill. Why is it that there is no hospital to be located in the South?

Mr. LANGLEY. The gentleman's statement is not quite accurate. We provide for the location of one hospital in the Central Southwestern States. Moreover, this is merely the initiation of an extensive hospital building program, and undoubtedly all sections of the country will be taken care of ultimately. If the gentleman will read section 1 of this bill he will observe that there is ample authority given by that section to the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire and improve all hospitals in every section of the country that may be available for this purpose, and to improve and make additions to them. This includes existing plants in the South. There was no purpose to discriminate against the South on the part of the committee.

Mr. ASWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGLEY. I have but very little time and I wish my friend from Louisiana did not feel compelled to interrupt me.

Mr. ASWELL. Does this bill give any advantage to existing hospitals?

Mr. LANGLEY. It does; yes.

Mr. ASWELL. Where does the money come from?

Mr. LANGLEY. I am coming to that in a moment, if Members will permit me.

Mr. LAZARO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGLEY. Briefly, but I must decline further interruption or violate my promise to members of the committee and other colleagues who have asked for time.

Mr. LAZARO. Is it the gentleman's understanding that where there are hospitals well located treating a limited number of patients that they will add to those hospitals before they will start new ones, so that early treatment will be given to as many as possible?

Mr. LANGLEY. The purpose of the committee was to do everything to expedite as much as possible the early treatment of these patients, and it is in favor of any action that will aid in accomplishing that end. The gentleman will find in section 1 abundant authority given to the Secretary of the Treasury to do that, provided he is given the necessary funds, which I have no doubt Congress will do.

Mr. LAZARO. The idea I had is this: That where you have a personnel of trained men and the hospital is well located and can only treat a limited number on account of the small amount of money available, would it not be better to add to that hospital rather than to start a new one, which will consume more time?

Mr. LANGLEY. The committee wants to aid in doing both; that is, to utilize all existing available and suitable plants and also construct new ones as quickly as possible. As I was going to say, before that action was taken it was represented to the

committee that there were many beds available for immediate use in the 10 National Homes for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers and that there were also a number of unoccupied Army posts which could be utilized with some rehabilitation for hospital purposes. The committee had in its possession at that time evidence which rendered it doubtful in their minds as to whether any considerable relief would be afforded through these channels, but, being anxious to economize as much as possible, further hearings were held to determine the exact situation, which we thought we already understood fairly well. These hearings were not only exhaustive, but frequently cumulative, even to the point of irritation of some of our committee members. Among others who appeared before the committee were Secretary of War Baker, Secretary of the Treasury Houston, Surg. Gen. Cumming of the Public Health Service and several of his staff, Col. Cholmeley-Jones, Director of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance, Gen. George H. Wood, president of the board of managers of the National Homes for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, a number of specialists on tubercular and neuropsychiatric diseases—who, of course, never agreed—and representatives of the American Legion and others. I can not go into all the details now, but it appeared that there were about 10,000 vacant beds in the national homes and some Army posts that might be available for hospitalization, in addition to a number of private hospitals already under contract, some of which were not entirely filled, and still others for which negotiations were in progress. I wish I had the time to go into all the difficulties and complications, administrative and otherwise, which developed in these hearings. As a net result the Public Health Service made a revised estimate that an authorization of \$10,000,000 would meet the situation instead of the \$15,000,000 which it had previously asked for the succeeding fiscal year.

Thereupon, a bill authorizing the former amount for new construction was introduced by me and promptly reported to the House at the last session by the committee. Every Member of this body knows that the legislative situation soon became such that it was impossible to get that bill passed before adjournment of that session. We secured a special rule for the consideration of that bill at this session, but before it was reported to the House our attention was called to the fact that the need for additional hospital facilities had grown much greater, and also that out of the 10,000 vacant beds in the national homes, the Public Health Service had been able to secure only about 1,700; that the estimate that 10,000 beds were available in the national homes was based upon accommodations for well men; and that if the entire space were used not more than 4,000 sick men could be accommodated in them at the most. The Secretary of War declined to grant more than temporary use of any Army post, which meant that patients might have to be moved elsewhere at any time, and he declined to permit the use of any of them for any tubercular patients at all, although these cases were of the most urgent character. We thereupon decided to report a more liberal bill, which is the one now under consideration. It carries an authorization of only \$13,000,000, it is true, but in section 1 there will be found abundant authority granted to the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase, enlarge, and improve any existing plants if he gets the requisite funds. Twelve and a half millions of this amount is provided for the construction of five new plants, and the other half million for improvements, and so forth, of the Walla Walla and Mackenzie Army posts, which are transferred from the War Department by a specific provision in the bill. The reason that the committee did not authorize an appropriation for other existing plants was that it had not yet obtained from the Public Health Service sufficient data as to the other plants to enable it to fix the amounts of the appropriations needed for them. At the same time the general authority carried in section 1 renders it unnecessary to get further authority through this committee. All that the Secretary of the Treasury will have to do is to convince the Appropriations Committee of the feasibility of the proposition and the amount needed.

A distinguished statesman in another body has referred to this as a pork-barrel bill. It is anything but that, and it was the express purpose of the committee to avoid that very thing; and so, instead of naming the cities or States where these new hospitals should be located, as the Public Health Service recommended, and which would have made it subject to that criticism, the bill designates certain zones within which they are to be located, and the committee took into consideration the climate and the needs for hospitalization in convenient localities as developed in the hearings, and framed the bill so as to give the Secretary of the Treasury the widest possible discretion in locating them.

Some effort has been made, much to my regret, to divert this question into political discussion. The committee had no such

thought, and I would be ashamed of myself if I felt that I had permitted such a consideration to influence me in the performance of my public duty in the face of such a grave and urgent situation.

In view of the fact that I have been a member of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds for a good many years, and for two years its chairman, some gentlemen may assume that I have seen to it that there are several public buildings in my district, and they will doubtless be surprised when I say that there is not a single one in the district, although several are badly needed. As a patriotic Kentuckian, I naturally feel that Kentucky is the greatest State in the Union, and also that the mountain section is the greatest part of it, and that this would be an ideal place for one of these hospitals, but I made no effort to get one of them located there by this bill, as it is merely the beginning of a great hospital-building project which may ultimately cost many times the amount authorized by this bill. We will take our chances later. I think public buildings, river and harbor improvements, and many other propositions involving great expenditures, many of which are being given preference over these hospital needs, should wait until we properly provide for these men who left their homes and their avocations and risked their lives and lost their health in making the sacrifice, without which these other matters might not have been of very much service to our Republic.

I am a party man and believe in party government to the maximum of what is patriotic and to the best interests of our country, as I view them, but I think we should stop this fooling and quibbling and this playing politics, if anyone is doing it, and stop yielding to local and selfish interests and provide as speedily as possible for these disabled heroes of the Nation. [Applause.]

I have said this much because I want this House, the American Legion, and all of our soldiers, and the people of the country generally to understand the truth and just how I stand and feel on this hospital subject. [Applause.]

Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANGLEY. No; I am sorry, but I can not yield. The gentleman can ask his question of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. ANDREWS], to whom I am to yield time and who is thoroughly familiar with the whole subject. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. WINGO].

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, there is no more pressing problem confronting Congress than the hospitalization of our soldiers. There is nothing that touches the hearts and consciences of the people more than the question, which should be solved and solved promptly, fully, and completely by Congress, of providing adequate facilities for the hospitalization of these soldiers free from any sectional discrimination or political trade or trafficking. I think I speak advisedly when I say that the objection on the Democratic side is not to the bill—we shall all vote for it as being the best thing we can get—but the thing the Democrats in this House do resent is that while the gentleman in charge of the bill deprecates partisanship and sectionalism and logrolling, yet as a matter of fact the bill is brought here under suspension of the rules of the House, so that the Democratic side of this House and no man on the Republican side of the House who wants to go further and offer amendments so as to meet the whole problem by a broad constructive bill instead of the piecemeal bill is denied the opportunity to do so. [Applause.]

I challenge you to throw the bill open under the general rules of the House and give us adequate time for discussion on both sides, Republicans and Democrats, give Members of the House, without regard to political faith or section, a right to offer amendments that will completely, wholly, and adequately take care of the hospitalization of our soldiers in every section of the country. If you do that you will find the hearty support of all the Democrats of this House. [Applause.]

Let us examine the bill. It provides for five locations in addition to the amendment that covers the New York proposition. It provides for only one tuberculosis hospital. Is that denied? Just one. Any man who has studied the problem of taking care of tuberculous patients in this country knows that it is folly to provide just one tuberculous sanatorium located in one part of the country to take care of all tubercular patients from all parts of the country.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINGO. I have not the time to yield under this gag rule. I say it is folly to take a man from my district to certain parts of the country, just as it would be folly to take a tuberculous patient from some parts of the country and bring him to the tuberculous sanatorium in my State.

Why is it that with millions to spend for every other purpose you can not at least give the soldiers the benefit of the doubt

and provide for all the hospitals necessary to meet their needs? Why do you limit it? The gentleman says that you are going to have one in the Central Southwest. Will some gentleman tell me where the Central Southwest is? I will tell you where it is, so far as this bill is concerned. It is a point in a certain city that lies away west of my congressional district, and everybody knows where you are going to locate that, and the gentleman who will profit politically by it has filled the newspapers of his State full of claims of what he has been able to do in getting a hospital under this bill. We shall vote to take care of the soldiers of New York; we shall vote to take care of the soldiers of New England; we shall vote to take care of the soldiers of the Rocky Mountains. In other words, we, the Democrats, shall vote to provide hospitalization for the soldiers in every section, and protest against making this a sectional bill by excluding one section of this country, which it does. Let us appropriate sufficient money, let us give the authority to those who know something about it ample funds and tell them to give the soldiers complete hospitalization in every section of the country. [Applause.]

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SUMMERS].

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the need for hospitalization for soldiers in the Northwest is very similar to what it is in other parts of the country. The supervising director of the Public Health Service in the Northwest states that there is need to-day for more than a thousand beds to take care of the disabled men in the thirteenth district, which includes Oregon, Washington, and Idaho. Fortunately we have there in old Fort Walla Walla, an old military reservation which has not been used for more than 10 years, splendid buildings and 611 acres of land, the best of water, fire protection, roads, walks, everything of that kind, all of which can be occupied within 30 to 60 days after the transfer is made from the War Department to the Treasury Department for hospital purposes. I hold in my hand photographs showing the splendid barracks that are idle and that have been idle for many years, and which can be utilized for hospital purposes. The State Legislatures of Washington and Oregon and, I believe, of Idaho have sent memorials to Congress asking that this transfer be made. The State legions of Washington, Oregon, and Idaho, as well as the local legions throughout the Northwest, are unanimous in requesting that this transfer be made. Every civic organization makes the same request. The plant at Fort Walla Walla would be valued at something like \$1,000,000.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. The War Department has no possible use for this plant?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. The War Department has not used it even during the Great War when we had 4,000,000 men in arms. They have not used it for 10 years. It is in the hands of a caretaker and is an expense to the Government. It will accommodate several hundred disabled men and is very greatly needed at this time.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, there are three things necessary for the cure of tuberculosis—climate, altitude, and out-of-door fresh air. You let one of our millionaire New Yorkers who becomes so unfortunate as to have one of his sons afflicted with tuberculosis, and having access to the best medical skill in the world, he sends his son as speedily as possible to the extreme Southwest—Arizona, or New Mexico, or certain parts of Colorado or certain parts of west Texas, where they have a chance of getting well. But when we go to provide for the soldier boys of the country the political Congressmen in the House of Representatives, in spending \$13,000,000 of the people's funds in the name of the soldier in a bill that when offered as it is now under suspension of rules you can not change by the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t" and upon which you have only 20 minutes for debate to a side—you make iron-clad provisions so we can not send them where the soldier boy can recover from the dread disease with which he is afflicted. It is a shame upon the committee, because you can not cure tuberculosis in the parts of the United States where you seek to place these hospitals. I say more crimes are committed in the name of the soldier nowadays than in almost all the other names put together.

Mr. LANGLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I am sorry; the gentleman had 20 minutes and I have but 3. Why can not you bring in a bill and open it up to the judgment of this House? Why can not you bring in a bill here—you know we are all going to vote for this one, even though we can not amend it, because I would vote for this bill regardless of its terms if it furnished any kind of relief to the disabled soldiers of our country. But locating these hospitals as political pork-barrel allotments is not going to cure tuberculosis. We have to-day in Houston, Tex., where I was born, in the hospitals there boys from almost every State in this Union suffering with tuberculosis. They are dying because the Army surgeons have not got sense enough to send them where they can recover. Houston, Tex., is not the climate for tuberculosis, while western Texas is the place. They are writing me every day, and you ought to see that they are taken out of Houston and out of New York and out of these other places and sent where they would have a chance to get well. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLEOD]. [Applause.]

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, if there ever was a time when I truly want to speak it is now, and on this bill. If this appropriation can not be granted through gratitude or in paying an honest debt, then, for God's sake, grant it for the sake of humanity. While we are here to-day and while the rest of you have been here for the past year heroic ex-soldiers are dying and have died. The men who offered themselves up for the sake of all our constituents, and gladly did it, are imploring every one of us to-day to give them some form of relief. Is it necessary that more die for lack of attention from us or will we go forth and grant aid which is within our powers, so that in the future we can sleep with a clear conscience and know that at least we have done that which we know is right.

Gentlemen, the condition is deplorable; the condition is ridiculously unhumanitarian. Thousands of these brave, unfortunate men have no place to be hospitalized; they must wait until vacancies occur in the few hospitals we have before they can get attention and treatment.

Gentlemen, I say that after this bill is discussed you will be so familiarized with prevailing conditions that there will be no excuse for prolonging further—to allow the most humanitarian appropriation that has even been requested from this body. [Applause.]

In the past Congress appropriated large sums of money to furnish our boys with armor and munitions to go forth and fight our battles. Now we request that Congress will appropriate a small sum of money in comparison for these same boys to wage a battle for their lives, and for which the previous battles were responsible. Is this not a just request and is it not just and important legislation? I say that it is the most just and important legislation that has yet come before Congress.

Mr. Speaker, if there remained but one day in which this Congress might legislate, that day, it seems to me, could be spent in no better way than in the consideration and passage of this bill to provide hospitals for the men disabled in the late war.

The story persists in history that once upon a time Darius, King of the Persians, in the course of an expedition against the Scythians crossed the Danube River, and upon being forced to retreat, stole away under cover of darkness and left his sick and wounded soldiers in camp to be the next day captured and slaughtered by the enemy.

If it were counted for shame against a barbarian king in a barbarian age that he abandoned his sick and wounded on the battle field, how much more will it be counted for shame against a great and wealthy Nation in an age of light and civilization if it permit the men disabled in its service to stagger from the battle field, unfriended, to poverty, sickness, suffering, and death.

Unless we bestir ourselves to do something for these men, history's finger of scorn will be pointed at us. Their condition at the present time is enough to arouse pity in hearts of stone and bring blushes of shame to even the most callous faces. Approximately 100,000 ex-service men have broken down since the end of the war with the wounds and sicknesses of service. They have come to the Government for hospital treatment and care, as Congress provided that they should, and they have passed through the miserable makeshift system of hospitalization we temporarily set up for them under the Bureau of War Risk Insurance and United States Public Health Service. By far the greater number of the 100,000 were farmed out at \$3 a day for such left-over treatment as might be had in private institutions run for profit. As an example of how inadequate and almost criminally negligent the system has been, let there be cited the instance of the eight shell-shocked veterans sent by

the Public Health Service to a little hospital in New York for feeble-minded and idiotic children, where these great husky veterans of St. Mihiel and the Argonne had to sit in tiny chairs made for infants and accommodate themselves to nursery conveniences. There might be cited further instance after instance where these men, who are the real heroes of the war, have been subjected to treatment such as a country would not ordinarily allow to be meted out to its drunks, degenerates, beggars, and criminals.

Nearly 100 veterans, about all of them tubercular and most of them gassed or wounded on the other side, were sent for treatment to a place at Markleton, Pa., situated in a low, marshy river bottom, with a lot of railroad tracks and cinder piles hard by. A great tuberculosis expert sent there to examine the place, after the boys finally protested, said that "they might as well have sent them to a coal mine for treatment." F. W. Galbraith, jr., national commander of the American Legion, after visiting the place, demanded that the men be removed. He said that their condition there was "unbelievable"; that men "were dying off like rats in a hole, with moldy clothing on their backs."

They sent 60 ex-service men, all either suffering from tubercular or mental disorders, to a place out in Illinois called Sunnybrook Farm. Conditions there became so bad that the American Legion sent the Illinois State commander to investigate, and among other things he reported:

We found the kitchen filthy. There was lack of sanitation. Floors were dirty, and the condition of the ice box and the food in it was indescribable. There was total absence of sex segregation. The clothing worn by the inmates was dirty and a bad odor was given off by their bodies. The rest of the place was in keeping with the places thus far mentioned.

The following wire was sent to the Public Health Service:

Conditions at Sunnybrook Farm such that it is absolutely unfair to keep disabled ex-service men there. The American Legion, Department of Illinois, demands immediate removal of these disabled veterans from such surroundings.

To which the Public Health Service wired back:

This office cognizant of conditions at Sunnybrook Farm. Patients have been ordered to be removed and will be as soon as other beds found available. Feel sure all patients will be removed by December 1.

The story of what happened at Tucson, Ariz., where ex-service men from all parts of the country who had contracted tuberculosis in the service and who could not get treatment from the Government got on trains and went down there to try to get well is another good illustration of how these men are not getting the hospital care and treatment they are entitled to by law as well as by common decency and justice. At one time there were more than 500 of our disabled veterans there practically without shelter, and all the Government could give them, any of them, was an old band stand and dance hall in a deserted amusement park and some tents. The American Legion finally got together there, and, with the governor of the State himself helping to wheelbarrow the rocks for the foundation, built a hospital for these men in 48 hours.

If such instances as these are not sufficient to convince one of the need of adequate Government hospitals for the war's disabled, individual witnesses could be summoned from one end of this land to the other who by their heart-wringing stories of neglect, destitution, and suffering would sweep away the last remaining doubt.

Just the other day there was brought to my attention a tragic case out in the great wheat country of the West. It is about a young boy, who in the spring of 1918, with head held high, went to France "to jest at dawn with death." There was great rejoicing when he came home with the American Expeditionary Forces, supposedly sound. Six months afterwards, however, it was noticed that he had become the victim of moods and spells of a depressing and mentally unsound nature. Finally, about eight months ago, the mother took the boy to the local office of the Public Health Service and had him examined, where it was determined that he was mentally disabled as a result of his service in France and entitled to treatment.

The Public Health Service promised treatment as soon as a place could be found. That was eight months ago. In the meantime the boy ran wild, and in the midst of one of these spells took a high-powered automobile and made way with it. He was arrested and promptly sentenced to four years in the State penitentiary. Upon arrival there, it was found that he was a mental case, and he was sent to the State insane asylum, where he is now behind the bars with the other criminal insane. An effort is being made now to get the governor to pardon the boy, but that can never blot out from that poor broken lad's mind the horrors he has lately gone through with nor make up to him the treatment he should have been given by a great and grateful Government.

Right here in Washington, under our very noses, not long ago a shell-shocked ex-service man was arrested and sent to jail for three months for stealing something to eat when he was hungry. His discharge paper, showing service on three battle sectors, was taken away from him as was the gold watch his mother gave him when he went to war. When they turned him loose, some kind-hearted policeman took him to the headquarters of the American Legion, and he was started on the long red-tape route necessary to get him hospital treatment. He is probably still waiting for us to pass this bill and set up a hospital in which he can get treatment instead of jail sentences.

One of the most pitiful letters I ever read was written on Christmas Day last by one of our disabled men suffering with tuberculosis. Unable to get any satisfactory hospital treatment from the Government, he had gone to try to get well himself on his own hook:

This is the blackest Christmas I ever spent. I am among total strangers without funds or health. I wish they had done with me as they do with a worn-out horse, then I would not suffer like this—

He writes.

It is useless to dwell longer on cases like those I have mentioned. I could cite them for hours and not exhaust the supply of them which have been called to my attention. I am sure that practically every Congressman knows of just such cases in his own district. These men are the casualties of the great unfinished battle that the disabled American soldiers, sailors, and marines are still waging against the grim reaper, death. They are the thousands of Yanks for whom the war did not end on November 11, 1918; for whom the long battle field of pain and suffering seems to stretch on and on into the valley of the shadow. Vividly one of them has cried out in these lines:

GOING WEST THIS WAY.

The trouble about going west this way
Is the inch by inch our souls must creep,
Up through the ramparts of darkness to day,
Up through the fields of pain to sleep.

The men who went west, like a lightning flash,
In that high bright hour of crimson flame,
Rode the steeds of death in a valiant dash,
To the high-towered land without any name.

God, but it's different to lie on a bed
And watch through the dark for a lingering dawn,
Held down by pain as by shackles of lead,
When our feet would be up on the way and gone.

What dreams come to us in the hush of the night,
When the world has forgotten and we are alone,
How we charge, strong limbed, in the midst of the fight
Toward far away hills we have marked as our own.

The trouble about going west this way
Is the dragging pace that our feet must keep,
Up through the valleys of night to day,
Up through the hills of pain to sleep.

Mr. Speaker, I can not understand how any Member of Congress can vote against this bill. It provides what should have been in existence long ago, Government hospitals for these disabled men who spent their strong young bodies in the service of their country. There are to-day 23,000 disabled ex-service men under treatment by the Government, and about one-half of them are in private institutions run for profit, in State insane asylums along with the criminals, paupers, and drug addicts, in county poor farms, and at times in jails. Both the Secretary of the Treasury and the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service have reported to us that 10,000 beds are urgently needed for these men. The need instead of growing less will grow greater—is growing greater every month. Reports of admissions and discharges of disabled ex-service men to and from hospitals for the last six months in 1920 show that 5,000 men are breaking down every month, whereas only 3,500 get better and leave the hospitals—a steady increase of 1,500 of these men every 30 days. Not only the 23,000 men under treatment to-day but about 60,000 disabled men who will come to the Government for treatment during the next 12 months will all suffer unless we do something. I am for this bill, and I am for it 100 per cent strong. If there is any objection to it at all, it should be on the grounds that it does not carry more money for more hospitals for these boys. I wish that the bill carried three times as much money for three times as many hospitals. I would vote for it with even more pleasure and pride than I shall vote for it as it is. There is no finer kind of economy that I know of than the economy of saving to the Nation the lives of as many of these men as possible.

Mr. Speaker, the ingratitude of republics may be a proverb, but it is a proverb which the Congress of the United States should make plain to the world shall not apply with reference to this Nation and her disabled veterans of the World War.

The surest investment we can make for the national safety, for the perpetuation of American ideals, the Declaration of Independence, and the Constitution is now to decently and gratefully mete out justice to the men who carried the flag victoriously through the Nation's latest and gravest peril. It is well to remember that even as republics have been ungrateful so have they gone down into dust and oblivion. Rome was secure upon her seven hills until she became ungrateful to her legions, and then there came a day when the Huns and the Goths and the Vandals from the northland swept down upon her. The old bugles blew in the streets of the city and upon the vine-clad hills near by. But the plowman stood to his furrow, the tradesman to his trade, the youth to his playing. The cry went out "The barbarians are coming!" and instead of mailed armies of defense there came in response the reply, "Let them come; they may be more grateful masters than those we now have." And so the barbarians came down upon Rome and burned and pillaged and sacked it to the ground. And now men can only speak of "the grandeur that was Rome." Let us of America take warning against the danger of neglecting our disabled heroes.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection.

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LAZARO]. [Applause.]

Mr. LAZARO. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I call the attention of the Congress to the importance of giving the soldiers early treatment so we can cure as many as possible, especially the mental and tubercular cases, because we know that those cases must have early treatment, otherwise they can not be cured. Feeling that way, I shall vote for this bill; but, to be frank with you, gentlemen of this House, I believe you are making a serious mistake. If you really want to do something for these tubercular and mental cases among the ex-service men, who have done so much for their country, I think the only thing to do, the proper thing to do, is to appropriate the money they need and leave it to the medical authorities to say where those boys shall be treated. It is not a question of localities or of buildings; it is a question of early treatment, and it ought to be left to the men who know how to treat those cases to say where they should be treated. I believe we should have more time to discuss this bill and an opportunity to amend the bill.

Mr. ROSE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAZARO. And under the rule, of course, we have not that opportunity to amend the bill, and the only way we can do anything at all is to vote for the bill as it is, and therefore I shall vote for it. I now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. ROSE. I merely desire to ask the gentleman whether or not he believes that the members of the medical profession itself would agree upon the location of the hospitals for the treatment of tuberculosis?

Mr. LAZARO. I believe the medical authorities who have charge of this money could select a commission composed of experts, especially in these tuberculosis cases, who would make a rapid survey and then decide where this money should be spent and where these boys should be treated. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I?

The SPEAKER. Four minutes.

Mr. RUCKER. Did the gentleman from Louisiana use all of his time?

Mr. LAZARO. I will yield back any time remaining.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman used all of his time.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL].

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a misunderstanding between Members of the House as to why New York State offered to build a hospital and rent it to the Federal Government. I want to say to the membership of the House that that was not a matter of our own initiative. The only reason that we are doing this is because we were requested by the Director of War Risk Insurance to do this in order that we might get quicker action in furnishing hospital facilities to the New York soldiers and others very much in need of it at the present time.

Our State has appropriated the money, has cut all the red tape, and will build this hospital in 10 months. The site has already been selected, and the probabilities are that the hospital will be ready to accommodate a thousand men before the

Government hospital property has even been started. In order to get the full information before the House, I would like to insert in the Record the original letter from R. G. Cholmeley-Jones, the Director of War Risk Insurance, and a short message from our governor to the legislature. I ask, Mr. Speaker, to extend my remarks as indicated.

THE SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

Mr. McCLINTIC. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CULLEN. I hope the gentleman from Oklahoma will not object to that, because it is very important.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I hope this will not be taken out of my time.

THE SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired. [Laughter.]

Mr. SNELL. I appreciate the courtesy of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McCLINTIC].

Mr. McCLINTIC. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that this bill does not permit of any amendment. To my own knowledge there are a number of Government buildings located in different portions of the United States that are at present not in use and that could be utilized for hospitals. Out in the western part of Oklahoma the Commissioner of Indian Affairs recently abolished an Indian school which is located only a few miles from the Wichita National Game Preserve. The altitude is high, the climate is fine, and no better conditions could be found at any place for the location of a tubercular hospital than there. At the present time we are compelled to send our boys who are suffering from this dreadful malady to Houston, Tex., and to other places where the climate is not good.

While I am going to vote for this bill, I am sorry indeed that it is not possible to introduce an amendment so that buildings that are already constructed and not in use could be utilized for tubercular hospitals.

THE SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker—

THE SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. SNELL. To ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McCLINTIC] may be allowed to extend his remarks in the Record.

Mr. McCLINTIC. I object, Mr. Speaker. [Laughter.]

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CULLEN].

Mr. CULLEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to follow along the argument presented by my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. SNELL], and I ask the privilege of reading this communication. I could explain it, however, without reading it, if I had more time. I shall have to hurry my reading:

STATE OF NEW YORK, EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Albany, September 29, 1920.

To the Legislature:

My attention has been called to a grave situation in relation to the care and treatment of veterans of the World War who have become mentally disabled. There are 845 ex-service men and women suffering from mental disorders being cared for in State institutions. Their average age is under 25, and in most cases they are suffering from the early stages of the disease; whereas the age of the average other patients in the State hospitals is above 55 years, and in most cases the disease is chronic.

These disabled men and women of the World War can not receive the proper treatment under the present system. They should be segregated into one institution at the earliest possible moment, in which event, I am informed, a great majority of them may be cured.

The following communication received by me from R. G. Cholmeley-Jones, Director of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance of the United States Government, explains the situation in detail, viz:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, August 19, 1920.

Hon. ALFRED E. SMITH,

Governor of the State of New York, Albany, N. Y.

MY DEAR GOVERNOR: In the Government's program for the care and treatment of its disabled veterans of the World War much difficulty has been experienced in the securing of adequate hospital facilities. This has made it necessary for the Government to send a very large number of the sick and disabled men to private, State, and county hospitals and sanatoriums.

At the present time there are about 19,000 disabled ex-service men and women scattered in more than a thousand hospitals throughout the United States. In New York, for instance, on August 1, there were reported 1,850 disabled men and women in 147 hospitals. This scattering of patients in such a large number of hospitals and sanatoriums makes proper governmental supervision of their treatment and cure most unsatisfactory not only to the Government but to the patients themselves.

The problem of the care of the mentally sick veterans has proven particularly complex and difficult, and in many localities it has been found impossible to secure hospital facilities of proper construction under medical administration in conformity with the best type of modern practice.

In New York State, for example, on August 1 there were reported 845 ex-service men and women suffering from mental disorders who were being cared for in 39 hospitals and sanatoriums, including State institutions. The Government is expending at the present time about \$400,000 for the care of approximately 443 patients in New York State hospitals annually. At this same rate were all the ex-service men suffering from mental and nervous disorders in New York State cared for by New York State hospitals the Government would be expending for such cases more than \$770,000 annually.

The situation as regards the care and treatment of these mental patients of the World War affects very much the World War veterans of New York State—not because the rate of insanity is higher in New York State than in other States but because of the very large quota of troops furnished by New York State in the recent war.

It is the bounden duty of the Government so to prepare itself at the earliest possible moment that it may properly care for the mentally diseased veterans of the World War in special psychiatric hospitals. This task must be approached with a profound regard for the rights of the disabled soldier and his relatives. In the State of New York the hospitals for the insane are not charitable institutions in the strict sense of the word, yet they are so regarded by many relatives of the ex-service men, and on this account there is a little reluctance to make use of them.

Of far greater importance, however, is the fact that medically and socially the insane ex-service man presents problems far different from those for which the great institutions of your State were created and are maintained. The average age of the ex-service men in the New York State hospitals is under 25 years, while, I am informed, the average of the other patients is above 55 years. The ex-service insane man is in the early stages of the disease and therefore has a greater opportunity for recovery under suitable treatment. The civilian patients, on the other hand, in the New York State hospitals represent very largely the terminal stages of insanity. Buildings, methods of treatment, recreation, and occupation which are suitable for the treatment of the somewhat elderly and more chronic patients are obviously not equally well adapted for young ex-soldiers.

The Government of the United States is without adequate hospital facilities in the State of New York for the reception and care of its insane beneficiaries in their State. A considerable time would of necessity elapse before the Government could construct such facilities even though it were considered wise to do so and the appropriations had been made by Congress and were now available. It therefore becomes necessary for the Government to seek the assistance of the State of New York. To this end I would invite your consideration to a plan calculated to meet the immediate emergency, at the same time making adequate provisions for the future care and treatment of the civilian patients of New York State, since in the interim the Government would have sufficient opportunity for developing its facilities for the care and treatment of the sick and disabled veterans.

If the State of New York would immediately undertake the completion of the Marcy division of the Utica State Hospital so that it could receive these beneficiaries at a per diem rate to be agreed upon by the Government of the United States and the State of New York, the immediate problem would be greatly simplified.

I would recommend that an appropriation be secured from the Legislature of the State of New York during its forthcoming special session for the construction and equipment of a 1,000-bed hospital for the insane, to be located at a strategic point, and to be erected and outfitted in accordance with the best views of modern psychiatrists. Further, that the governor be authorized to enter into a contract with the United States whereby the Government shall take over and operate this institution under lease for a term of years contingent upon congressional appropriations.

In this way the institution would be gradually paying for itself, the rentals constituting a credit in the treasury of the State, and upon the relinquishment of the property by the Government the State would be in possession of a modern institution at little or no cost, which would be an excellent addition to the already admirable system of State hospitals at a time when, in all human probability, there would be a great need for such an institution by the State.

I sincerely hope you will regard this proposal as sufficiently practical to include it in your message to the special session of the State legislature, in order that the matter may be given consideration at the earliest practical moment.

If it meets with your approval, and at such time as is convenient to you, the Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service and I will be very glad indeed to call upon you in order that all of the important details may be gone into very thoroughly.

Sincerely yours,

R. G. CHOLMELEY-JONES, Director.

I therefore recommend an appropriation for the construction and equipment of an additional hospital to take care of these disabled veterans of the World War, and also recommend the enactment of legislation authorizing the governor to enter into a contract with the United States Government to take over and operate such hospital.

ALFRED E. SMITH.

Mr. Speaker, as a result of Gov. Smith's appeal, my State appropriated \$3,000,000 to build a hospital on the site at Creedmoor and building operations have already started. I hope this bill will receive the unanimous vote of the Congress. [Applause.]

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

THE SPEAKER. One minute is remaining to the gentleman.

Mr. RUCKER. I confess I am not a good mathematician, and therefore have not kept accurate track of the time, possibly.

I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PARRISH] the balance of my time.

Mr. PARRISH. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I wish to say that I am very much in favor of this bill. I sincerely trust that politics will never be allowed to creep into any measure that seeks to relieve the disabled soldiers and those suffering from disease. The chairman of the committee has just said that this is but the beginning of a plan that will relieve all these men. May I not earnestly suggest that now is the time to pay the debt, and now is the time to appropriate

the necessary money to take care of all of these men, and discharge the obligation that the Nation owes to these young men who have suffered and who have become afflicted with diseases, and who demand now, not in the future, the attention of the American Government, so that this relief may speedily be given them? This is a note that America owes, and it is payable now and not at some future time. [Applause.]

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I think it is most unfortunate that any man should get up on the floor of this House and assume to advise not only this body of men but the soldiers who are suffering from tuberculosis and other diseases, thereby carrying the message to those suffering boys that we are not providing facilities in those localities where they can be properly treated and cured. We had before our committee the best tuberculosis experts in the country, and they all claimed that it was not a matter of climate and location alone; that under proper conditions, treatment, and surroundings, almost regardless of climatic conditions, these men could be cured. I want to call the attention of Members of this House and the country at large to the fact that Liberty, N. Y., and Saranac Lake, N. Y., were pioneers in this work; that thousands have been cured there, and that thousands will be cured in this new hospital to be located in the State of New York under the terms of this bill. [Applause.]

The reason why the Legislature of the State of New York appropriated \$3,000,000 for a hospital is obvious. The people of the Empire State do not intend to neglect their soldiers, especially those who now find themselves afflicted with disease and in need of hospital treatment. The State of New York furnished 367,864 men for the World War, which is 9.79 per cent of our entire Army. This proposed hospital will have served thousands of men before the other hospitals proposed in this bill are erected and ready for occupation. It is highly important, therefore, that this measure should receive the support of every Member of this House.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield my last minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ELLIOTT].

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, we are all heartily in favor of this bill.

I was somewhat amused at the ignorance which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] displayed as to the health conditions existing in the State of New York. The fact is that the rich people of New York, from charitable feelings, have built in that State the finest tuberculosis sanitarium in the world, and it is the first institution of the kind that ever was built in the world for the open-air treatment of tuberculosis. The fact also is that there are more soldiers up in that part of the country waiting for treatment for this dread disease than in any other part of the country, and the people in New York State are entitled to have sanitariums erected there for the treatment of their own people. And not only that, gentlemen, but the biggest share of the money that comes from the people of the United States to build these hospitals comes from the taxpayers of that State. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's time has expired. All time has expired. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill?

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER. Two-thirds, in the opinion of the Chair, having voted in favor thereof—

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to have a record vote. I call for a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 239, noes 0.

So the bill was passed.

AMENDMENT OF TRANSPORTATION ACT OF 1920.

Mr. ESCH rose.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and to pass the bill (H. R. 15836) to amend the transportation act of 1920.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin moves to suspend the rules and pass the bill which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 15836) to amend the transportation act, 1920.

Be it enacted, etc., That the transportation act, 1920, is hereby amended by adding after section 211 a new section, to read as follows: "SEC. 212 (a) In making certifications under section 204 or section 209, the commission, if not at the time able finally to determine the whole amount due under such section to a carrier or the American Railway Express Co., may make its certificate for any amount definitely ascertained by it to be due, and may thereafter in the same manner make further certificates until the whole amount due has been certified. The authority of and direction to the Secretary of the Treasury under

such sections to draw warrants is hereby made applicable to each such certificate. Warrants drawn pursuant to this section, whether in partial payment or in final payment, shall be paid: (1) If for a payment in respect to reimbursement of a carrier for a deficit during the period of Federal control, out of the appropriation made by section 204; (2) if for a payment in respect to the guaranty to a carrier other than the American Railway Express Co., out of the appropriation made by subdivision (g) of section 209; and (3) if for a payment in respect to the guaranty to the American Railway Express Co., out of the appropriation made by the fifth paragraph of subdivision (i) of section 209.

"(b) In ascertaining the several amounts payable under either of such sections, the commission is authorized, in the case of deferred debits and credits which can not at the time be definitely determined, to make, whenever in its judgment practicable, a reasonable estimate of the net effect of any such items, and, when agreed to by the carrier or express company, to use such estimate as a definitely ascertained amount in certifying amounts payable under either of such sections, and such estimates so agreed to shall be binding in final settlement."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SIMS. I demand a second, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered. Is there objection?

Mr. SIMS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I want to see if the gentleman from Wisconsin will agree to some extension of the time. There are many that want to have something to say on this bill, and only 20 minutes are allowed. Will the gentleman from Wisconsin agree that the time be extended on both sides, to be equally divided? Twenty minutes on a side is not sufficient for either side. Would the gentleman suggest an extension of time, to be divided?

Mr. ESCH. I am willing to ask for an extension of 10 minutes on each side. That would make 20 minutes in addition to the 40 minutes already allowed both sides.

Mr. SIMS. It would be 30 minutes, all told, on either side?

Mr. ESCH. Yes.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I do not object to that.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to extend the time to 30 minutes on a side. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand the gentleman from Wisconsin—

Mr. KEARNS. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. I understand the gentleman from Wisconsin is in favor of the bill, and also the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee is opposed to it.

Mr. BLANTON. Very well.

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I do not withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin that a second be considered as ordered? There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Tennessee has 20 minutes.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask to be notified when I have used seven minutes.

The SPEAKER. Very well.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, under the Federal control act the Government guaranteed, as the compensation to the railroads for the use of their property during Federal control, the average annual railway operating income based upon the three years which preceded July 1, 1917. That guaranty continued during the 26 months of Federal control, but the railroads did not earn the guaranty to the extent of over \$600,000,000.

When the transportation act was passed, becoming effective March 1, we included a provision that the guaranty provision of the Federal control act should be continued for a period of six months, terminating on the 1st of September. We put in that provision because we knew that the railroads had not earned the compensation during the 26 months of Federal control by hundreds of millions of dollars. We knew they had not earned it for any of the 26 months of Federal control, save 3. We knew that there were pending applications with the Director General of Railroads for increases of wages for shopmen and yardmen and switchmen and other organizations. We knew that those applications had not been acted upon by the Director General of Railroads. We knew that these men had been put off from time to time on promises that their wages would be increased. They were not increased during Federal control. We knew therefore that we had to provide for such an emergency.

One thing we did not know, however, was that the Railroad Labor Board, which was created by the transportation act,

would not be appointed by the President for six weeks after the law became operative. We did not know that within one month after Federal control ended there would be a strike, an unlawful strike, under the leadership of Mr. Grunau, of Chicago, involving from 40 to 60 per cent of the yardmen and switchmen in the great freight-producing centers of the United States.

Those things we did not know. But the transportation act by guaranteeing the standard return for the six months enabled the carriers to operate notwithstanding these severe handicaps. We find now that the guaranty will amount to something like \$600,000,000 for the railroads and \$31,000,000 for the American Railway Express Co.

I understand that it will be charged here that the Government ought not to have made such a guaranty. Without it the transportation system of this country would have failed before the six months would have expired. We could not have anticipated this unlawful strike, which crippled and cramped the transportation of the country and lessened the revenues of the carriers. We could not have anticipated the strike of the coal miners, when whole coal regions stopped operations for weeks, thus lessening the transportation of the carriers and thus reducing their revenues.

The \$600,000,000 required to make good the guaranty is chargeable in part to the order of the Railroad Labor Board of July 20, 1920, increasing the pay of these yardmen, switchmen, and shopmen who had been promised increases under Federal control and the pay of other employees by \$618,000,000, retroactive to the 1st of May, 1920, which meant that for four months of the six months of the guaranty period the railroads had to pay over \$200,000,000 additional wages. The guaranty provision is a legal obligation. This bill seeks to permit the payment of what is left unpaid of that guaranty by means of partial payments.

Under subsection (h) of section 209 of the transportation act there has been paid to the carriers by way of advances the sum of \$264,000,000 and to the American Railway Express Co. \$19,700,000, leaving unpaid something like \$340,000,000. If this bill passes this balance may be paid in partial payments.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has consumed the time indicated by him.

Mr. ESCH. I will take two minutes more. The Interstate Commerce Commission, believing that the language of the law we had passed justified partial payments, issued certificates therefor. The Comptroller of the Treasury, however, held that they could not be issued, and the Secretary of the Treasury followed the decision of the Comptroller of the Treasury, which decision was confirmed by a decision of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia. After that decision the Interstate Commerce Commission did not feel warranted in issuing certificates for partial payments. That left \$340,000,000 due to the carriers and the express company, but not payable to them until the carriers could make out a statement of the whole amount which the Government owed them under the guaranty section.

The result will be a delay of weeks, months, and in some cases years; because, as you know, any railroad company can not on a given date make a final statement. There are deferred items of debits and credits arising out of personal injury cases, loss and damage claims, reparations, and things of that kind, which, going through the channels of the courts, will take years for final settlement. So if this decision of the Comptroller of the Treasury is sustained and final statements must be made before certificates can be issued, it may take many months and in some cases years before settlements can be made.

In the meantime, what is happening? The railroads can not pay for supplies.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has consumed his two minutes additional.

Mr. ESCH. I will take one minute more. The supply people can not pay their employees. As a result many institutions have cut down their working forces and some have shut down their plants, because they can not get the money which the railroads claim is due them under the terms of the transportation act. In this bill we simply want to give the Interstate Commerce Commission the right to issue certificates for partial payments and have them honored by the Treasury Department, so that the railroads can get this money, so that unemployment can be reduced, and so that this money can be put into circulation, and so that business may be restored. [Applause.]

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] five minutes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I voted in the committee for the favorable reporting of this measure to the House. I would like to be able to support it on its passing through the House,

but when I voted for reporting it in the committee I do not think there was a member of the committee, including those on the majority side, who anticipated that an effort would be made to jam this bill through the House on a suspension of the rules, without debate that amounts to anything, and without any opportunity to amend it. I dare say that in the history of Congress there has never been an appropriation measure of \$340,000,000 put through the House of Representatives without debate and without an opportunity to amend it. [Applause.] That is what this practically amounts to, a direction to the Secretary of the Treasury to pay out of the Treasury immediately practically \$340,000,000.

We have never yet passed a bill under suspension of the rules providing that the Government shall pay its other obligations without an opportunity for Members of the House even to state the reason for their support of the bill or to offer an amendment to it. If we consider an appropriation providing for the ordinary expenses of our Government, every Member of the House of Representatives has an opportunity to offer an amendment by which the interests of the Government may be protected. I have in mind one or two amendments which ought to be adopted to safeguard the Government, and which I shall offer, if given a chance. But under this proceeding no Member has the slightest right to offer it. We must accept it as it is or not at all.

Mr. TEMPLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I have only five minutes.

Mr. TEMPLE. There is no appropriation contained in this bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. There is no appropriation, no; but it directs the Secretary of the Treasury to pay out the money upon certificates issued by the Interstate Commerce Commission, and some of these certificates are now lying in the Treasury Department, having been issued by the Interstate Commerce Commission before the Treasury declined to pay them. This bill nowhere protects the interests of the United States Government. Under subsection (h) of section 209, which authorized the Secretary of the Treasury to pay out advancements as recommended by the Interstate Commerce Commission during the six months' guaranty period, it was provided that before these advancements should be made by the Secretary of the Treasury he should have the power to require the railroads involved to give bond that if the Government under the advancement paid more than was due the road would pay back the excess with interest at the rate of 6 per cent.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I can not yield.

Mr. SNYDER. The gentleman knew all these things when he voted the bill out of the committee?

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course I knew all these things when I voted the bill out of the committee, but I voted the bill out of the committee with the distinct understanding, as every member of that committee always does, that I had the right to offer amendments, or that any Member of the House would have the right to offer amendments, if the bill came up as any other bill, for any other interest outside of the railroads would have come up under similar circumstances. [Applause.]

Mr. REAVIS. Did the gentleman offer an amendment in the committee?

Mr. BARKLEY. I think I offered the amendment in the committee, and the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission made the statement that it was agreeable, so far as the commission was concerned. Whether I offered it or not, such an amendment was offered, and I voted for it. But even if it was not offered, we should have the right to offer any amendment now.

Now, on the 26th day of January this bill was reported to the House. On the 31st of January the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Esch] introduced into this House a resolution, H. Res. 663, for a rule under which this bill could have been brought in and considered under debate, and under the right of amendment on the part of any Member of the House. I understand that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Winslow], who is the author of the bill, himself expected that this bill would be brought in under a rule. Why is it not here under a rule? The Rules Committee has had this resolution before them for a week. They have known that this proposition was pending before the House of Representatives. Why is it that the Rules Committee have not brought in this bill with a rule which would give us debate and give us an opportunity to offer amendments to the bill? I have been told that the members of the Rules Committee were inclined to bring in a rule that would give ample consideration and opportunity for amendment, but I have been told that, on the contrary, the steering committee, or those who are in charge of the majority in this

House, have prevented the Rules Committee from bringing in a rule that might give us an opportunity for debate.

It is nothing short of an outrage that this bill is brought in under these conditions. There are many Members on both sides of the House who want to support it. I myself will support it under proper conditions, but I will not vote to suspend the rules and pass this bill without debate or amendment, and I trust that there will be enough votes on both sides to defeat it and force the Rules Committee to bring in a rule to open it up for debate, so that we can all offer amendments to it.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise my remarks.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to revise his remarks. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. I shall object to the House giving unanimous consent to something the gentleman has a perfect right to do.

The SPEAKER. Of course, the gentleman has the right to revise his remarks.

Mr. BARKLEY. I withdraw the request.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN].

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I voted for the passage of the Esch-Cummins bill, and I have no apology to make now for doing so. I voted to report this bill to the House for consideration, and I have no apology to make for that. But when I voted to report this bill to the House I thought then, as I have always thought, that that committee, or much of its procedure in this House was left to the members of that committee. If the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WINSLOW], the author of this bill, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ESCH], had had their way, I am sure that what we voted for in the committee would have happened in this House, and that was that we would report this bill to the House for its consideration.

I think that the main purpose of this bill is good and should be enacted into law, but I think that there are some amendments that ought to be adopted. In a bill of this great character this House should at least have an opportunity to consider it, to discuss it, and to offer amendments to it.

This committee has always been under the leadership of great chairmen, a nonpartisan committee. It would be to-day if the gentleman from Wyoming had not taken charge of the management of the bill. [Applause.] Last week I made a courteous request of the gentleman from Wyoming to know if it was on the program to bring this bill up and ram it down the throats of the House to-day under suspension of the rules. I thought then that the gentleman from Wyoming had the information. I do not agree that the gentleman from Wyoming's shoulders are stooped by carrying any great load of information, but I think such as he has with reference to the procedure of the House he ought to give the House.

I want time on the bill to discuss some matters coming up with reference to the general transportation system of this country. You need not think that if you vote this bill down to-day that it will not come up for consideration in this Congress. This move here to-day is made in the face of everything that has been agreed to in our committee since its organization for fair consideration. This move is made in order to protect the leadership of this House, the members of the Rules Committee, because they are afraid to report a rule for a bill and not report it on other matters. They are saying that they will not report a rule on this bill and that therefore they will not report any rules at all. I voted for the Esch-Cummins bill, but when I voted for it I went the limit. If the railroads of this land can not operate under the generous provisions of that law, we have got to do something else in the future. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. WINSLOW. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I shall not take up very much of the time of the House in trying to discuss the bill we have before us for consideration. I am of the opinion that this bill is of vital importance and should be considered and passed by Congress as speedily as possible. There is only one question involved in this measure and that is whether or not the railroads shall receive from the Government partial payments of money due them under the six months' guaranty provision of the transportation act, known as the Esch-Cummins railroad law, which provided for the return of the railroads to private operation. These payments are undisputed by the Interstate Commerce Commission. If these partial payments are not made by the Government the railroads will be compelled to wait until they can make a final accounting, and a great many of the roads are not ready or able at this time to submit final accounting on account of undetermined items such as loss and damage matters. The Interstate Commerce Commission in its last annual report

recommends legislation of this character. I quote from page 30 of this report, in which the commission says:

The immediate payment to some of these carriers of the amounts or parts of the amounts which we can now determine to be certainly due them under the guaranty provisions of the transportation act, 1920, is vital to their meeting operating expenses, fixed charges, and other obligations which they must meet in order properly to serve the public as common carriers.

I want to call the attention of the Congress to certain phases of the minority report on this measure which was filed by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS].

Of course most Members of the House well know the attitude of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] relative to the private operation of our railroads. He is against private ownership and operation of the transportation systems of our country and he would return the railroads to Government control and operation to-day, if it were in his power to do so. And I am of the opinion that the gentleman from Tennessee, in the minority report which he has filed against this bill, is trying to discredit the private operation of railroads and their management by picturing them as grasping corporations of greed and avarice that should be branded with the term "plutocratic dollarism," as he calls it in his report.

The gentleman from Tennessee has made some astounding misstatements of facts, which I, as one member of the committee who favors the passage of this bill, can not let get by unchallenged. In part of his report the gentleman from Tennessee says:

That such a deficit could arise during six months—all spring and summer months—with no strikes, no flood, no fires, no let-up in traffic, is so astonishing as to challenge our credulity.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Tennessee, Judge SIMS, knows that a very short time after the railroads were returned to private owners there was started and carried on for several months one of the most disastrous unlawful railroad strikes our country has ever experienced. In certain parts of our country, especially in the big industrial centers and in the larger cities of Chicago, Cleveland, and Pittsburgh, railroad transportation was for many weeks almost at a standstill. During this strike there was a great stagnation of freight. Miles and miles of cars loaded with merchandise, building material, coal, and other products glutted the railroad tracks, sidings, yards, and terminals. The loss of revenue to the railways by reason of this unlawful strike amounted to millions upon millions of dollars. And yet the gentleman from Tennessee in his minority report tries to tell us that there were no strikes during this period.

Mr. Speaker there is another item of expense which the railroads had to meet during the six months' period that I want to bring to the attention of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS]. Some time toward the close of the month of July, 1920, the Railway Labor Board granted an increase in the wages of railway employees which amounted to the sum of over \$600,000,000 annually, and this increase was retroactive to May 1, 1920. So that the additional expense to the railroads for wages from May 1 to September 1, 1920, when the guaranty period ended, was over \$200,000,000. I am not criticizing the Railway Labor Board for this decision, for I believe that the railway employees were entitled to an increase in wages at that time, but I am of the opinion that by reason of the wage increase and the unlawful strike during the six months' guaranty period the deficit incurred by the railroads was more than double what it would have been had these two important events not occurred. And while I hold no brief for the railroads, I think it is manifestly unfair to the cause of successful private operation for the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SIMS] to make in his report such misleading statements in his earnest and ambitious desire to discredit the railway operators and private ownership of our transportation systems.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired. [Applause.]

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON].

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, the railroads are like a beast of prey, which having gorged itself upon its victim now returns with a new appetite to gnaw the bones.

Section 209 of the Esch-Cummins Act—the transportation act of 1920—guarantees that for six months following the approval of that act the net earnings of the railroads shall equal the compensation paid by the Government under Federal control, and that any deficiency in such earnings shall be paid from the Public Treasury. Section 204 extends this vicious guaranty to those railroads which were never under Federal control. The guaranty is not conditioned on efficient or economical management, nor even upon honest management. The railroad managers were left free to enter upon an orgy of extravagance, waste, and dishonesty. The Treasury foots the bill.

EARNINGS SHOULD NOT HAVE BEEN GUARANTEED.

The earnings of the railroads should never have been guaranteed. They are conducting a private business. There is no more reason why the Government should guarantee their profits than the profits of a farmer, merchant, or other business man.

Few people of the country knew that the guaranty was given. There are even Members of Congress who were ignorant of the fact. The guaranty ought not to have been given. It constituted a betrayal of the public interests. It can not be excused nor justified. The railroads profited from Federal control. They received profits which they could not have earned in private control. The net profits of some of the railroads under Federal control were enormous; for instance, the Union Pacific received 12.8 per cent upon their investment, and the Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe 10 per cent. Numerous others received from 6 to 10 per cent. The guaranty gave them the same profits, and on top of that the opportunity for waste, extravagance, and graft. For instance, it gave to the Union Pacific a net earning of 12.8 per cent no matter how wasteful and dishonest was its management.

The guaranty ought not to have been given. The Government got nothing from the guaranty; not a cent of benefit went into the Treasury; it was merely a donation to the railroads.

But the guaranty was given. Perhaps it will be said that it constitutes a contract which the United States is bound to perform. I am willing to perform our contracts, unwise though they may be. I opposed the transportation act with all my strength, but I will live up to that act. I will give the railroads all we promised them. I will perform their oppressive bond, but I insist that they take their pound of flesh exactly as it was agreed upon—that they cut it when and where the contract stipulates. They shall not cut their pound of flesh in advance, it is not "so nominated in the bond."

GUARANTY NOT YET DUE.

By the terms of the guaranty advances to meet current expenses were authorized during the six months' period, but no payments can be made after the six months except a payment in full upon a final ascertainment of the amount due. Many railroads received advances under the guaranty; these advances aggregated, under section 209, \$260,391,874, and, under section 204, \$622,877.49. The balances which they may be entitled to receive are not yet due and will not be due until there is a final settlement, which in the case of some railroads may be postponed for several years, and during that time no interest thereon will accrue. The Winslow Act proposes to anticipate the payments not yet due under the guaranty and to pay to the railroads in advance and without deduction of interest the sums which it may be estimated will be found due them upon a final settlement. In its most favorable light it proposes a cold gift to the railroads of the interest which will accrue on the deferred payments. It proposes that a debtor shall now pay his note due several years hence without discount and without deduction for unaccrued interest. No man can deny this statement.

But my opposition to the Winslow bill, which proposes to pay now what may be estimated to become due in the near future, is not based upon mere sentiment nor yet merely upon the loss of interest by anticipating payment. I realize that if the railroads are compelled to wait for their money until there is a final settlement we will have a final settlement soon.

The railroads will file their claims without delay; we will pay the amounts in sight as due; and that will be the end of the matter. But the guaranty does not limit the time within which final settlements must be made. Claims may be made 10 years hence if the Winslow bill is passed and we pay the railroads their present claims. Final settlements will be delayed indefinitely. Partial payments will be claimed from time to time. The matter will be drawn out, and not only hang over for many years, but added claims will be made. New items will be presented. Aggregations will be swelled to the limit, and in the end the Public Treasury will be plundered for perhaps \$200,000,000 more than if final settlements now were made. The Winslow bill stands to cost the people not only long delay and vexation, but a loss of perhaps \$200,000,000 of public money.

A BILLION-DOLLAR GIFT TO RAILROADS.

When the transportation act was passed it was estimated that \$400,000,000 would cover the cost of the guaranty. But already the guaranty has cost \$261,140,751.49, and additional claims are already made of about \$370,000,000. The estimated cost of the guaranty has already jumped from \$400,000,000 to \$631,000,000. Under the Winslow Act the total will reach \$800,000,000 to \$900,000,000. Think of it! A cool gift of almost \$1,000,000,000 from the public funds to the railroad interests of the United States.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, it has been pointed out forcibly, clearly, and distinctly by gentlemen who have preceded me that no such bill as this ought to be considered under suspension of the rules. There is ample reason why it should not be so considered. This bill provides potentially for \$400,000,000 to be taken out of the Treasury upon the issuance of a certificate by a commission, without any further action or consideration by the Appropriations Committee of this House, without even the estimate being filed and considered by any appropriating committee, the appropriation being automatic under the transportation act. Not even an amendment can be offered. What is the matter with the bill? Is it so good that no Member of the House should be permitted to even offer an amendment to it? I have two amendments which, if I were permitted to do so, I should like to offer, and they are in the interest of both the railroads and the country. One of them I would offer on page 1, line 12, of the bill by striking out, after the word "certified," all of the rest of the paragraph and inserting the following:

Said certificate shall bear interest at the rate of 6 per cent per annum from date of issuance until paid.

That would give the railroads the right to collect 6 per cent per annum from the time the certificate is issued until finally paid. Then I would add the following proviso at the end of the bill:

Provided, That all claims under the guaranty provisions of the transportation act not certified by the Interstate Commerce Commission prior to January 1, 1922, shall be forever barred.

There ought to be a limitation as to when these claims can be audited and final amount payable definitely ascertained.

If paragraph (h) had not been put into the law, no railroad would claim that it could get anything at all until after the guaranty period had expired. Paragraph (h) was put in to add them to pay fixed charges and operating expenses during the guaranty period, as applications for an increase in wages and also of an increase in rates were pending, which it was supposed would take about the time of the guaranty period to finally adjust and determine. It was therefore provided that if the commission should certify that a certain sum would be payable to a railroad and that it was necessary for the railroad to have enough of that amount to pay fixed charges and operating expenses, the Secretary of the Treasury from time to time might advance such an amount. Every railroad that made such application and showing to the commission during the guaranty period under paragraph (h) got its money. That is where the \$260,000,000 went, including the amount advanced to the American Railway Express Co. They are now claiming that there are loss and damage claims that they have not yet adjusted. That may be true; but if we are going to pay money out of the Treasury, why not wait until you know what the amount is going to be. These railroads could sell every one of these certificates that bears interest at the rate of 6 per cent, at par, the moment they are offered. But there is a joker in this bill. Advancements under paragraph (h) could be made only on condition, first, that the advance was necessary to pay fixed charges and operating expenses of the road, and, second, that the carrier should give a contract with security that in case the advance exceeded the amount that would be payable to the railroad finally the excess should be paid back to the United States with 6 per cent interest.

This bill provides no protection to the Government in case of excess payments on certificates. It provides that the Interstate Commerce Commission certificates must be paid in full and no return whatever to the Government is provided for such excess of payment. Many railroads will get money under this guaranty that are now insolvent. Much of this money is paid to railroads as an increase in deficits over prior deficits. Not a dollar can be gotten back in case more is paid than turns out to be owing to such insolvent roads. Why did you a few months ago think that the public deserved the protection of a contract with security to return excess of advances, and now provide that no return of the excess on the certificates for payment of guaranty is to be secured, as was required for excess advances during the guaranty period?

If this motion to suspend the rules and pass this bill is not adopted, we can immediately adopt a rule that will give proper time for general debate and leave the bill open to amendments. I would vote for such a rule myself, but this motion ought to be defeated. [Applause.]

Mr. WINSLOW. Mr. Speaker, we have had rather an effusive and elaborate line of statements aimed at this bill, but so far as I recollect no speaker has undertaken to show that it is not without merit; none has undertaken to show that it is not a sane and wise bill, in so far as it goes. I want to answer my two

distinguished and friendly colleagues on the committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. RAYBURN]. The gentleman from Kentucky, much to my surprise, undertook to give out the thought to this body that this bill amounts to a new appropriation.

Nothing of the kind. It simply clarifies an agreement between the Government of the United States and the carriers as to the payment of Government debts agreed to by debtor and creditor. Under the provision of the general transportation act, 1920, the Government was to pay, under a guaranty provision, such and such sums. The Treasury Department has seen fit to interpret the law to mean that a balance must be struck to a nicety before any payment is made to any carrier, regardless of its need, right to payment, and regardless of common commercial practice.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Will the gentleman permit me—

Mr. WINSLOW. No, sir; pardon me. I recognize my association on the committee, and I will yield to him briefly.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I understand from the gentleman's position that the bill does not enlarge or diminish the existing guaranty, but simply enables the Government to make several payments instead of one payment in settlement of such guaranty?

Mr. WINSLOW. Stated with absolute accuracy. Now, the query is this: With the railroads in the condition they are in they can not pay their supply houses, and those creditors run into the thousands in this country; they extend clear into the wood lot. If the carriers can not pay their creditors, the next creditor in line can not be paid, and so on and so on. The mines of Indiana, I have been told, in some instances have already been shut down, and many operatives have been thrown out of work because the mine owners can not collect the money due them from railroads to enable them to pay their operatives; and so it goes. It is a straight business, horse-sense proposition. Do we want the Government of the United States, working under our direction and under our legislation, to hold up commercial activities, and, particularly at this time, keep money from creditors to whom it is due? There is not a business man in the United States who does not at one time or another, even in good times, make advance payments to his creditors. Here we have millions of men throughout the United States unemployed begging for something to do. Would we withhold \$300,000,000 which the Government has and which if put into ordinary commercial productive channels would insure work to many, many thousands of men immediately? Will this Congress take the position that it will not tell the Treasury Department to pay its bills with money already appropriated, with no change of contract whatsoever, even if we, the Government, pay on account? It is only a business proposition. If you have any business sense at all, my friends, you will try to stimulate the productive activities of the United States, and nothing will help more than the payment of these \$300,000,000, more or less. We know well that a sum of \$300,000,000 of cash turned into trade channels now is worth, with its attending credit, a billion dollars to keep the wheels of industry going. Let us go to it and put business in motion and set an example for the country. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired; all time has expired. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill?

Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 220, nays 111, not voting 98, as follows:

YEAS—220.

Ackerman	Crago	Freeman	James, Va.
Anthony	Cronin	Fuller	Jeffers
Bacharach	Crowther	Glynn	Johnson, S. Dak.
Begg	Cullen	Good	Johnson, Wash.
Benham	Curry, Calif.	Goodykoontz	Johnson, N. Y.
Benson	Dale	Graham, Ill.	Jones, Pa.
Bland, Ind.	Dallinger	Green, Iowa	Kearns
Bland, Va.	Darrow	Greene, Mass.	Kendall
Boies	Davis, Minn.	Greene, Wt.	Kennedy, R. I.
Briggs	Dempsey	Griest	Kiess
Brinson	Denison	Hadley	King
Brooks, Ill.	Dickinson, Iowa	Hamilton	Krans
Buchanan	Donovan	Hardy, Colo.	Langley
Burdick	Drewry	Hawley	Lankford
Burrroughs	Dunbar	Hays	Layton
Butler	Dunn	Hernandez	Lee, Calif.
Byrns, Tenn.	Dupré	Hersey	Leibach
Caldwell	Dyer	Hickey	Lithicum
Campbell, Kans.	Eagan	Hicks	Little
Campbell, Pa.	Eagle	Hill	Longworth
Cannon	Edwards	Holland	Luce
Cantrell	Elliott	Houghton	Lufkin
Christopherson	Elston	Howard	Luhring
Cleary	Esch	Hudspeth	McAndrews
Coady	Evans, Mont.	Hull, Iowa	McArthur
Cole	Fairfield	Husted	McDuffie
Cooper	Fess	Igoe	McFadden
Copley	Foster	Ireland	McKenzie

McKinley	Newton, Mo.	Riddick	Temple
McLaughlin, Mich.	Nicholls	Rodenberg	Thompson
McLaughlin, Nebr.	O'Connor	Rogers	Tilson
McLeod	Ogden	Rose	Timberlake
McTherson	Olney	Rowan	Tinkham
MacGregor	Osborne	Rowe	Towner
Madden	Padgett	Sanders, N. Y.	Treadway
Magee	Paige	Scott	Valle
Mann, Ill.	Park	Sells	Vare
Mansfield	Parker	Shreve	Vestal
Mapes	Parrish	Siegel	Voik
Martin	Pell	Sinnott	Walsh
Merritt	Peters	Slomp	Ward
Michener	Phelan	Small	Watson
Miller	Porter	Smith, Idaho	Watkins
Mishan, N. J.	Pou	Smith, Ill.	Watson
Monsahan, Wis.	Purnell	Smith, Mich.	Webster
Mondell	Rainey, Henry T.	Snell	Wheeler
Montague	Ramsey	Snyder	White, Kans.
Moore, Ohio	Ramseyer	Stephens, Ohio	White, Me.
Moore, Va.	Randall, Wis.	Stines	Williams
Moore, Ind.	Ransley	Strong, Kans.	Winslow
Morin	Reber	Strong, Pa.	Wood, Ind.
Mott	Reed, N. Y.	Sullivan	Woods, Va.
Murphy	Reed, W. Va.	Sweet	Woodward
Neely	Rhodes	Swindall	Yates
Newton, Minn.	Ricketts	Taylor, Colo.	Zhiman

NAYS—111.

Almon	Doughton	Lazaro	Stegall
Anderson	Drane	Lee, Ga.	Stedman
Andrews, Nebr.	Evans, Nebr.	McClintic	Steenerson
Aswell	Fields	McKeown	Stephens, Miss.
Ayres	Fisher	Major	Stevenson
Bankhead	Flood	Mason	Stoll
Barbour	Frear	McAd	Summers, Wash.
Barkley	Gallivan	Milligan	Summers, Tex.
Bee	Garner	Nelson, Mo.	Swope
Bell	Garrett	Oldfield	Tague
Black	Godwin, N. C.	Oliver	Taylor, Ark.
Blanton	Hardy, Tex.	Quin	Thomas
Bowling	Hastings	Raker	Tillman
Box	Haugen	Rayburn	Tineher
Brand	Hayden	Reavis	Upshaw
Browne	Hoch	Robison, Ky.	Venable
Byrnes, S. C.	Huddleston	Romjue	Vinson
Caraway	Hull, Tenn.	Rouse	Voigt
Carrs	Humphreys	Ruby	Volstead
Carter	Jacoway	Rucker	Weaver
Clark, Mo.	Johnson, Miss.	Sanders, La.	Welling
Collins	Jones, Tex.	Schall	Welty
Connally	Keller	Sears	Wilson, La.
Crisp	Kelly, Pa.	Sherwood	Wingo
Davis, Tenn.	Klecza	Sims	Wright
Dickinson, Mo.	Lampert	Sinclair	Young, N. Dak.
Dominick	Lanham	Sisson	Young, Tex.
Doremus	Larsen	Smithwick	

NOT VOTING—98.

Andrews, Md.	Ellsworth	James, Mich.	Noian
Ashbrook	Emerson	Johnson, Ky.	O'Connell
Bakka	Evans, Nev.	Juhl	Overstreet
Baer	Ferris	Kahn	Patterson
Blackmon	Fish	Kelley, Mich.	Periman
Bland, Mo.	Focht	Kennedy, Iowa	Radcliffe
Bowers	Fordney	Kettner	Raney, Ala.
Britten	French	Kincheloe	Raney, John W.
Brooks, Pa.	Gallagher	Kinkaid	Randall, Calif.
Brumbaugh	Gandy	Kitchin	Riordan
Burke	Ganly	Knutson	Robinson, N. C.
Candler	Gard	Kreider	Sabath
Carew	Goldfogle	Leshner	Sanders, Ind.
Casey	Goodall	Lomergan	Sanford
Chindblom	Goodwin, Ark.	McCulloch	Scully
Clark, Fla.	Gould	McGlemon	Smith, N. Y.
Classon	Graham, Pa.	McKiniry	Steele
Costello	Griffin	McLane	Taylor, Tenn.
Currie, Mich.	Hamill	Maher	Walters
Davey	Harrell	Mann, S. C.	Whaley
Dent	Harrison	Mays	Wilson, Ill.
Dewalt	Hersman	Moon	Wilson, Pa.
Doelling	Hoy	Mooney	Wise
Dowell	Hullings	Mudd	
Edmonds	Hutchinson	Nelson, Wis.	

So, two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof, the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. HARRELD and Mr. EDMONDS (for) with Mr. MANN of South Carolina (against).

Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania and Mr. WALTERS (for) with Mr. ROBINSON of North Carolina (against).

Mr. FOCHT and Mr. CHINDBLOM (for) with Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. KAHN with Mr. DENT.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania with Mr. STEELE.

Mr. PATTERSON with Mr. KINCHLOE.

Mr. HUTCHINSON with Mr. EVANS of Nevada.

Mr. BOWELL with Mr. BRUMBAUGH.

Mr. EMERSON with Mr. DOOLING.

Mr. BITTEN with Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky.

Mr. FORDNEY with Mr. GARD.

Mr. ANDREWS of Maryland with Mr. WISE.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois with Mr. ASHBROOK.

Mr. KNUTSON with Mr. MAYS.

Mr. RADCLIFFE with Mr. SCULLY.

Mr. GOODALL with Mr. DAVEY.
 Mr. SANFORD with Mr. RIORDAN.
 Mr. KINKAID with Mr. O'CONNELL.
 Mr. HULINGS with Mr. SMITH of New York.
 Mr. MUDD with Mr. KITCHIN.
 Mr. FISH with Mr. OVERSTREET.
 Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee with Mr. BARKA.
 Mr. JUUL with Mr. CANDLER.
 Mr. BAER with Mr. SABATH.
 Mr. SANDERS of Indiana with Mr. CAREW.
 Mr. BOWERS with Mr. MOONEY.
 Mr. PERLMAN with Mr. GRIFFIN.
 Mr. BROOKS of Pennsylvania with Mr. RANDALL of California.
 Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin with Mr. McKINIRY.
 Mr. KELLEY of Michigan with Mr. RAINEY of Alabama.
 Mr. COSTELLO with Mr. HERSMAN.
 Mr. JAMES of Michigan with Mr. HARRISON.
 Mr. GOULD with Mr. McLANE.
 Mr. NOLAN with Mr. HOEY.
 Mr. McCULLOCH with Mr. LESHNER.
 Mr. KREIDER with Mr. MOON.
 Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa with Mr. FERRIS.
 Mr. BURKE with Mr. CLARK of Florida.
 Mr. FRENCH with Mr. GANDY.
 Mr. ELLSWORTH with Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY.
 Mr. CLASSON with Mr. MCGLENNON.
 Mr. CURRIE of Michigan with Mr. BLACKMON.
 Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to vote "yea."

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman present and listening when his name was called?

Mr. FISH. No, sir. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, whether this is permitted or not, but I was in my office, and only two bells rang in the Office Building.

The SPEAKER. That is the gentleman's misfortune. The gentleman was not present and listening, and therefore can not vote.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I did not get clear the statement of the vote.

The SPEAKER. The result was—yeas 220, nays 111.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a recapitulation.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that is a reasonable request. The House will be in order, and the vote will be recapitulated.

The Clerk recapitulated the vote.

The SPEAKER. No corrections having been made, the vote will stand.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I rise to propound the unanimous-consent request that I may be permitted to ask the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] when we may expect this Winslow bill to be brought up again.

FEDERAL AID IN CONSTRUCTION OF POST ROADS.

Mr. SELLS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Roads, I call up the bill (H. R. 15873) to authorize the appropriation of additional sums for Federal aid in the construction of post roads, and for other purposes, and I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 15873) to authorize the appropriation of additional sums for Federal aid in the construction of post roads, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, and all acts amendatory thereof and supplemental thereto, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the following additional sums:

The sum of \$100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922.

The aforesaid additional sum shall be expended in accordance with the provisions of such act: *Provided*, That the aforesaid additional sum, together with any sums apportioned to any State under the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, and all acts amendatory thereof and supplemental thereto, and not heretofore withdrawn from the principal fund, as provided by section 6 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes," approved February 28, 1919, shall be available for expenditure in that State for the purpose set forth in such acts until two years after the close of the respective fiscal years for which any such sums become available, and any amount so apportioned remaining unexpended at the end of the period during which it is available for expenditure under the terms of such acts shall be reapportioned in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States

in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916: *Provided further*, That in each State in which the percentage of total land area to which the title of the United States is unqualified or exempt by act of Congress from taxation in said State exceeds 10 per cent of the total area of all lands in the State the Secretary of Agriculture may reduce the ratio of cooperation required, but not to below one-half that which the total of the patented, tax exempt, and national forest land bears to the total area of all lands in the State.

Sec. 2. That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1922, for national forest roads and trails.

The said appropriations for national forest roads and trails to be available until expended by the Secretary of Agriculture for the survey, construction, and maintenance of roads or trails within, partly within, or contiguous to the national forests when such roads or trails are necessary for the use and development of the resources of the national forests or desirable for their proper administration, protection, and improvement or for the extension of important main highways.

Sec. 3. That any person, firm, corporation, member of any highway commission, or employee thereof that makes any false statement or representation as to the character of material used or quality of work performed in the construction of any project approved by the Secretary of Agriculture under the provisions of said act, with the intent to defraud the United States, shall upon conviction be imprisoned not to exceed five years or pay a fine not to exceed \$10,000, or be punished by both imprisonment and fine.

Sec. 4. That the Secretary of Agriculture shall make annual report to Congress of the amounts expended hereunder.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALSH. That it is not in order to make the motion under a suspension of rules to pass this bill, because it has been reported in violation of Rules XX and XXI, as amended, in that in section 1 it makes an appropriation of funds heretofore appropriated by Congress. In the rural post roads bill of 1916—

The SPEAKER. To what part does the gentleman refer?

Mr. WALSH. Page 2, section 1, making available the appropriations of the post roads bill of 1916, the Post Office bill of 1920, approved in 1919, and making available for expenditure for two years moneys previously appropriated and, but for the passage of this act, coverable into the Treasury. And a bill making available moneys which but for the bill would return to the Treasury of the United States, and making that sum available in addition to sums authorized in the bill under consideration is, in effect, appropriation and is contrary to Rules XX and XXI.

The SPEAKER. Is there any reason why Rules XX and XXI should not be suspended?

Mr. WALSH. Not taking away the right of a point of order under that rule. The point of order can be made at any time. The bill has been reported in violation of that rule, and if the point of order is made it prevents the motion to suspend the rule as to that bill, because the bill has been improperly reported by a committee that has exceeded its jurisdiction.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be heard on the point of order.

Mr. Speaker, I shall take only a moment of time, but I do not think there is anything in the point of order that my good friend from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] has made.

Now, what is a point of order? A point of order is that there is some objection to your method of procedure in the consideration of the bill; that it is in contravention of some rule of the House.

Now, under the general rules of the House certain committees have jurisdiction of certain legislative matters, and if those matters are reported from some committee other than the one having jurisdiction under the rule a point of order would lie against them except when called up under a motion to suspend the rules.

Now, my good friend says the legislative effect of this resolution is legislation, that it makes available for this road fund certain appropriations that would lapse into the Treasury but for this legislation. That is correct, but the rules of the House, Mr. Speaker, provide for legislation by the suspension of the rules. It is not necessary, where a motion to suspend the rules is made, that the legislative matter may have ever been before any committee of this House. If the Speaker should recognize me to move to suspend the rules, I could draft right here a resolution providing legislation and offer it, and it would be in order for consideration by the House and no point of order would lie against it, notwithstanding it had never been to any committee whatever.

Now, the motion before the House is to suspend every rule of the House. It suspends the rule authorizing points of order against matters because they were not at first considered by some committee; and I am sure the Speaker, in his long and distinguished service here, has many times seen enacted, by a motion to suspend the rules, legislation that has never been to any committee of the House whatever.

I could talk on, Mr. Speaker, but I would but repeat what I have said, and I do not care to take up the time of the House. I am thoroughly convinced that the point of order of my distinguished friend is without merit. Mr. MAPES, of Michigan, has just called my attention to a precedent which upholds the position I take. I refer you, Mr. Speaker, to section 6862, Hinds' Precedents.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, if the Chair will indulge me a moment further, I recognize the force of the argument of the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP], who has as sound a knowledge of parliamentary law as any other gentleman in the House. But I wish to direct his attention to this fact, that this rule was passed and became effective July 1, 1920, and in the rule itself it is provided that this particular point of order can be made at any time. It must have been had in contemplation when that phraseology was included in this new rule that the rules of the House provided for a suspension of the rules.

Mr. Speaker, the point I am making is this, that the motion to suspend the rules of the House does not take away the right to make a point of order specifically provided for in a rule subsequently adopted, to the effect that a committee shall not have authority to report a bill, not to take up for consideration a bill but to report a bill; and the gentleman has called up for consideration a bill which has been reported, and on that bill he has moved to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Now, under the phraseology of these Rules XX and XXI, I submit that a motion to suspend the rules can not brush aside the right to make a point of order and confer, for the purpose of that particular legislation, the right to report any appropriation.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. CRISP. Does my friend contend that the new rule, changing the jurisdiction as to certain appropriation matters, has any superior force or strength or privilege over any other rule of the House?

Mr. WALSH. Why, I contend, Mr. Speaker, that in so far as the rule applies to the action of the committee on a bill prior to its consideration in the House, as to what the committee may do in reporting a bill and bringing it up before the House, it does have superior force, and that it can not be suspended by a motion to suspend the rules under the ordinary procedure of the House, because that bill is subject to a point of order as being upon the calendar improperly and the committee exceeded its jurisdiction.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. CRISP. Does not my friend recognize that this very motion moves to suspend the very rule he is relying on, as well as any other rule in the House?

Mr. WALSH. No; I do not recognize anything of the kind.

Mr. CRISP. That is the effect of the motion to suspend the rules and agree to pass this bill.

Mr. WALSH. I can not agree with my distinguished friend from Georgia. It moves to suspend the rules relating to the passage of any particular measure, but it does not suspend the rules as to jurisdiction belonging to any particular committee. This bill was called up from a committee by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SELLS]. He mentioned the number of the bill and also the calendar number when the bill was reported by the Clerk.

I submit that a motion to suspend that rule does not take away the right of a Member to make the point of order that the jurisdiction of the committee has been exceeded.

Mr. McARTHUR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. Certainly.

Mr. McARTHUR. Does the gentleman think that the Committee on Appropriations had jurisdiction of this legislation?

Mr. WALSH. Oh, the gentleman knows that in this very bill the committee has carried an authorization to make an appropriation which gives the Committee on Appropriations jurisdiction to appropriate; but this language is an appropriation. That is all I desire to submit, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, if the Chair is not ready to rule, I will say that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] has presented me with a decision on all fours with the position I take.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is going to overrule the point of order.

Mr. CRISP. That is in accord with the contention I make. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. The Chair would state that, in his judgment, the reason why the point of order is not valid is that the rule allowing suspension suspends all rules. The Chair thinks that applies to the rule relied upon by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] as well as others. It is not necessary that the bill should have been reported by the committee. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SELLS] moves to suspend the rules and pass the bill which the Clerk had reported, and the Chair thinks that suspends every rule, and the point of order does not lie. Is a second demanded?

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi. I demand a second.

Mr. McARTHUR. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. Had the Clerk finished the reading of the bill?

The SPEAKER. Yes; the reading of the bill had been completed. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. STEPHENS] demands a second. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi. No, sir; I am not.

Mr. DUNN. I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. DUNN. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks he ought to recognize a gentleman opposed to the bill. The gentleman from New York [Mr. DUNN] is on the committee. The gentleman demands a second.

Mr. SELLS. I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts objects. The Chair appoints as tellers the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SELLS] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. DUNN].

The House divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 137, noes 20.

The SPEAKER. A second is ordered, and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. SELLS] has 20 minutes, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. DUNN] has 20 minutes.

Mr. SELLS. Mr. Speaker, the time allotted for the consideration of this bill will preclude anything like a thorough discussion of the road problem and the wisdom of Federal cooperation with the States in road construction. In reporting this measure the committee does not assume that it solves the question or that the plan it submits is ideal. We have thought it best to provide for a continuance of the work during the next fiscal year, leaving to a later Congress any changes in the system which circumstances may render necessary.

To defer action at this session of Congress would be dangerous, and might defeat all road construction in many of the States, where further legislative action is necessary to enable them to become beneficiaries under the existing system. The legislatures of probably two-thirds of the States are in session now, and until Congress decides this question none of them can act intelligently or provide adequately for a continuing program.

In submitting a brief report on this bill, I called attention to the fact that the benefits accruing are not so much the actual aid rendered as the stimulus afforded to the various States and their subdivisions to provide for themselves the funds necessary to secure national aid. The first appropriation made by Congress in 1916 for this purpose was \$75,000,000, followed by another in 1919 for \$200,000,000, or a total of \$275,000,000. And yet in 1919 alone so great was the incentive of the national road act that the States themselves provided an aggregate fund of \$400,000,000, followed by an expenditure of probably \$500,000,000 in 1920. During the nearly five years since these appropriations were first available more than 20,000 miles of public roads have either been constructed or let to contract, on which the Federal Government has expended or agreed to expend approximately \$150,000,000, or an average of about \$7,000 per mile.

Opponents of this measure will no doubt emphasize the fact that there still remains in the Treasury \$117,000,000 unexpended and unallotted, and seek to show that a further appropriation at this time is unnecessary. The committee is strongly of the opinion that such a conclusion is unwarranted. At hearings before the Roads Committee it was shown by numerous State highway commissions throughout the country that practically every dollar of Federal moneys appropriated will have been allotted by the close of the present fiscal year.

Federal funds apportioned to the States are not considered as allotted until projects submitted by the States have been actually approved by the National Bureau of Roads. Before any State may submit a project a thorough survey must have been made and submitted for approval to a national highway engineer and the funds provided for the payment of

the State's share in the cost of construction. If the State is cooperating with the counties within its jurisdiction, the same process must be repeated. And I might add that while the Federal Bureau of Roads deals directly with no smaller units than the States themselves, as a matter of fact the counties in a majority of the States provide the funds necessary to secure national aid. If a county is required to furnish any portion of the fund, in every instance at least a year must elapse, and in most cases more than a year, before proper surveys can be completed, the plan of county, State, and Federal cooperation perfected, and the final contract for construction awarded and approved by the Federal department. And until all of these successive steps have been completed the record in the Bureau of Roads shows the allotment still available. So any conclusion that there is still an available balance of \$117,000,000

unpledged and unallotted is wholly incorrect, for from this must in equity be deducted the cost of such projects as may be in course of preparation for final submission.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SELLS. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Is there anything in this bill that changes the existing law whereby the States are to participate in this appropriation?

Mr. SELLS. Nothing of any material nature.

I desire to file as a part of my remarks a table compiled from the records of 47 States showing the status of this work on January 15, the unexpended and unallotted balances due each of them, and the probable date when the Federal appropriations will be exhausted:

Status of Federal aid funds for roads compiled from reports of State highway departments, Jan. 15, 1921.

State.	Amount of Federal aid available for contracts Dec. 31, 1920.	Federal aid funds put under contract since Dec. 31, 1920.	Federal aid funds which will be put under contract by Apr. 1, 1921.	Amount of Federal aid for new contracts, Apr. 1, 1921.	Mileage at \$20,000 per mile.	Date when all Federal aid funds will be absorbed by contracts.	Federal aid appropriation under Sells bill, 1921.
Alabama.....	\$4,146,582.58	\$141,858.64	\$2,000,000.00	\$2,004,723.94	100	July 15, 1921	\$2,104,883.51
Arizona.....	1,330,892.69	650,679.00	500,000.00	380,213.69	19	July 1, 1921	1,373,644.16
Arkansas.....	2,132,310.47		84,191.47	2,067,619.00	103	Apr. 1, 1921	1,685,178.09
California.....	4,987,034.57		3,137,034.57	1,800,000.00	90	July 1, 1922	3,054,675.51
Colorado.....	2,965,800.14	32,000.00	1,755,759.17	1,178,130.97	85	Oct. 1, 1921	1,755,759.17
Connecticut.....	864,901.70			864,901.70	43	July 1, 1922	613,349.43
Delaware.....	162,674.83	162,674.83		(1)	None.	(?)	162,674.81
Florida.....	915,918.48	915,918.48		(1)	None.	(?)	1,147,447.92
Georgia.....	1,531,287.62	1,531,287.62		(1)	None.	(?)	2,697,150.95
Idaho.....	391,250.86	319,250.86		(1)	None.	(?)	1,226,049.03
Illinois.....	1,133,328.97	992,473.97	173,855.00	(1)	None.	(?)	4,365,037.91
Indiana.....	4,715,924.61		2,500,000.00	2,215,924.61	—12	July 1, 1922	2,687,053.27
Iowa.....	2,140,009.14	473,200.00	1,030,000.00	635,809.14	—32	Dec. 31, 1921	2,881,328.74
Kansas.....	3,602,611.67	828,282.00	500,000.00	2,274,329.67	113	do.....	2,871,244.62
Kentucky.....	2,979,384.79		1,503,000.00	1,479,384.79	—74	do.....	1,954,755.43
Louisiana.....	109,501.57		109,501.57	(1)	None.	(?)	1,362,231.13
Maine.....	1,160,685.57			1,160,685.57	58	June 30, 1921	960,230.18
Maryland.....	521,363.07		521,363.07	(1)	None.	(?)	835,998.61
Massachusetts.....	2,210,243.09	121,416.30	155,300.00	1,932,455.79	93	Oct. 1, 1921	1,472,788.83
Michigan.....	3,651,657.55	294,729.00	1,500,000.00	1,855,928.55	—93	Mar. 1, 1922	2,891,657.97
Minnesota.....	1,063,203.02		359,109.23	704,093.79	30	May 15, 1921	2,842,089.33
Mississippi.....	3,139,812.29	160,000.00	300,000.00	2,679,812.29	—134	Dec. 31, 1921	1,807,557.77
Missouri.....	6,318,478.71		513,810.00	5,804,668.71	290		3,387,890.60
Montana.....	2,444,363.31	356,100.00	335,000.00	1,753,293.31	87	Dec. 31, 1921	2,005,997.13
Nebraska.....	2,611,635.66			2,611,635.66	130	Dec. 31, 1922	2,133,741.98
Nevada.....	2,301,897.18		200,000.00	2,101,897.18	105	(?)	1,276,344.43
New Hampshire.....	233,281.99		8,500.00	224,781.99	11	Oct. 1, 1921	414,838.98
New Jersey.....	1,818,272.02	346,640.00		1,471,632.02	73	June 30, 1922	1,187,553.45
New Mexico.....	2,514,643.61		330,000.00	2,184,643.61	109	(?)	1,598,467.85
New York.....	12,801,615.67		1,000,000.00	11,801,615.67	590		4,971,893.11
North Carolina.....	1,423,894.68	212,000.00	310,000.00	901,894.68	45	July 1, 1921	2,279,053.30
North Dakota.....	2,587,555.70		1,125,000.00	1,462,555.70	73		1,536,227.80
Ohio.....	5,142,955.71		1,000,000.00	4,142,955.71	207	July 1, 1921	3,705,246.81
Oklahoma.....	3,955,494.60						2,302,478.33
Oregon.....	411,717.28	42,000.00	100,000.00	269,717.28	13	May 1, 1921	1,576,152.03
Pennsylvania.....	1,830,291.29	397,291.29		1,433,000.00	71		4,594,945.05
Rhode Island.....	191,085.13	100,000.00	91,085.13	(1)	None.	(?)	233,255.87
South Carolina.....	2,273,920.50	515,767.05	236,247.79	1,521,905.75	76	July 1, 1922	1,436,019.04
South Dakota.....	2,181,729.04	200,000.00	700,000.00	1,281,729.04	64	Dec. 31, 1921	1,615,779.44
Tennessee.....	2,520,905.98	476,363.00	550,000.00	1,494,139.98	—75	July 1, 1921	2,281,913.90
Texas.....	7,795,539.77	2,059,453.90	2,251,015.77	3,485,120.10	—173	June 1, 1921	5,851,538.45
Utah.....	1,124,881.38	163,031.13	546,272.41	414,954.29	29		1,123,575.65
Vermont.....	743,181.73		500,000.00	243,181.73	12	Oct. 1, 1921	450,077.09
Virginia.....	2,775,393.28	91,000.00	1,000,000.00	1,684,393.28	84	Dec. 31, 1921	1,977,673.83
Washington.....	108,257.53	45,257.83	60,000.00	(1)	None.	(?)	1,444,627.79
West Virginia.....	16,599.45	16,599.45		(1)	None.	(?)	1,080,152.77
Wisconsin.....	4,094,599.67	75,000.00	750,000.00	3,269,599.67	84	Dec. 31, 1922	2,544,945.35
Wyoming.....	808,249.17		500,000.00	308,249.17	15	July 1, 1921	1,233,715.84
Total.....	117,050,370.00						

¹ All contracted.

² Already absorbed.

³ Jan. 1, 1923, unless ratio of cooperation is changed.

The above statement shows that there are 10 States which have no Federal funds whatsoever for additional contracts. There are also 25 States which have Federal funds to contract only from 11 to 100 miles of road, at \$20,000 per mile. Reports of contracts made since Dec. 31, 1920, have not been received from Oklahoma.

This report shows that 10 of the 48 States have already contracted for the expenditure of their respective allotments, and that at the present rate of progress 13 additional ones will be without funds after the close of the present fiscal year ending June 30 next. Only eight States will have an unallotted balance to their credit at the close of the present calendar year.

The only question then which is presented in the consideration of this bill is this: Did the Congress of 1916 and 1919, which provided this plan of cooperation, err in judgment, and have the results justified its wisdom? Personally, I believe that our action has been wise and approved by a vast majority of the American people. There have been in some instances graft, incompetency, inefficiency, and a thousand kindred ills. But the fact remains that progress has been made and that every State in the Union has been encouraged and stimulated to take up earnestly this great work. And the sums expended have been by comparison utterly insignificant. For the fiscal year

ending June 30 last Congress appropriated for all purposes \$5,686,000,000. Of that amount \$168,000,000 was expended for public improvements, and about one-half of that sum was for road construction, or only 1½ per cent of the total appropriations of Congress for that year.

Could this bill be presented to the American people for an expression of their judgment, an overwhelming majority would give it their indorsement. And I hope that the day may soon come when their judgment and desires in the matter of appropriation and expenditure of their own money may find expression in the action of this Congress.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNELL). The gentleman has used 10 minutes and reserves 10 minutes. The gentleman from New York [Mr. DUNN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I feel rather embarrassed in presenting this matter to the House, because of the lack of busi-

ness acumen, you might say, that has been displayed by the committee.

In the first place, early in December a flock of delegates came to this city and asked for a hearing, which was more like a deafening than a hearing. The Committee on Roads heard them on the subject of additional appropriations for good roads. In spite of the fact that it was shown that there was \$200,000,000 balance to the Federal road fund, and in spite of the fact that there had been only \$47,000,000 paid out of the original appropriation, they insisted with great clamor that this additional appropriation be made at this time.

Previous to this hearing I had taken up the matter with the Chief of the Bureau of Roads in the department, and I asked him to give me the exact amount of cash that had been spent or paid out to the States on account of road building. He reported that up to November 30, 1920, the amount paid out on this account had been \$47,300,000, that some roads were in the course of construction, but that the time for them to be finished was not definite, and therefore he could not report just what the payments would be on that construction.

In the meantime I asked him to give me the figures on how much road construction had been completed up to the 1st of January, 1920. He gave me the figures at something less than \$25,000,000 of Government appropriations that the States had received on account of construction of completed roads.

During the spring and summer of 1920 there was about \$22,000,000 more paid out for completed construction, and he reported a balance not paid to the States on November 30 of about \$26,000,000. Why that balance was not paid to the States, or why the States had not called for the balance did not appear to me, so in my calculations I did not deduct it from the amount of the original appropriation.

Everyone knows something about good roads. We have a great many roads in this country which are not good, but there are a sufficient number of good roads so that people understand the value of them. There is no argument against them. The question is whether in the present financial situation in this country, when we are committed to economy, and when we are faced with so many unpaid debts, and when so many supply bills are not acted upon, we shall pass this \$100,000,000 of an extra appropriation with a balance of \$200,000,000 remaining in the Treasury unexpended and \$117,000,000 not yet even allotted.

Mr. ASWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DUNN. No; I will not yield. No plans have been put in for that amount of money.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DUNN. For a brief question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. A complete allotment has been made.

Mr. DUNN. But no agreements between the bureau and the States, covering this \$117,000,000, have been made. There is a question about these allotments to which I wish to call attention. There are agreements subject to execution, projects favored, spread on the books, so that the States will get the money without any lapse the 1st of July. The Bureau of Roads informs me that no lapse of money will occur until after June 30, 1922, on account of the nonparticipation of the States. In my State of New York I had the pleasure of voting \$50,000,000 which, with the previous amount that was appropriated, has not yet, I believe, been entirely spent. Most of these roads that have been built were built for five to seven or ten thousand dollars a mile, and they were very good roads at the time, but they now have gone to pieces to such an extent that it took \$9,000,000 last year to resurface those roads, and it needs far in excess of that amount for this year.

This good-roads question is one that ought not to come up now in this short session, with no statement from the Bureau of Roads except the report that has been made. In the last conference I had with the Chief of the Bureau of Roads I said, "You have now, in round numbers, an unexpended balance of \$200,000,000. The States have got to appropriate 135 per cent in addition to meet that fund. How many million dollars' worth of road construction can be completed from now on under the present conditions provided they meet the unexpended Federal appropriation?" He said, "Around a half a billion dollars."

Now, we speak rather flippantly of a hundred million dollars lately in this House. The interest on \$100,000,000 at 5 or 5½ per cent will pay the expenses of this Congress for a year.

Mr. SNYDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DUNN. Yes.

Mr. SNYDER. How long would it take to spend that half a billion dollars which you claim is now available on the basis of the amount that has been spent per annum for the last four years?

Mr. DUNN. It would take around 10 years, perhaps.

Mr. MADDEN. On the basis of the present cost of roads, \$40,000 a mile. That would build 12,000 miles of road.

Mr. LINTHICUM. The gentleman says we are appropriating \$100,000,000; we are only authorizing it.

Mr. DUNN. When the original bill passed the House the limit per mile of Government participation was \$10,000. That has since been raised to \$20,000 a mile, and an effort is being made to raise it to \$30,000. Does anybody know what a joy-ride road costs a mile? The Pennsylvania delegation last year said it cost \$62,500, against \$40,000 the year previous.

Now, to go on and build these roads at the present price of materials, the high cost of construction, and add to this already large amount of unexpended money would be little short of ridiculous.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Is it not true that a great many of the States have issued more than enough bonds to take up the Federal allotment?

Mr. DUNN. They may have done so; there is no reason why they should not, but you can not have roads manufactured in a factory; you can not buy them in a department store. It takes long and continued labor to build them.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Does not that emphasize the fact that we ought to authorize them a little ahead?

Mr. DUNN. We have got plenty ahead for future construction; there is \$500,000,000 available, or which will be available if the States meet requirements, which can not be spent for two years, as far as we can learn from people well qualified to state what length of time it takes for this construction. You can not work every day in the year; you can not work over half the time, and 18 months' work means 3 years of construction, really.

I do not know how this House will look at it, but to me it is not a business proposition at this time. We owe large amounts of money, we do not know where we can raise the money to pay for these roads and to pay for our large supply bills. We are going to work months on those items. We came here committed to economy. We talk about a business administration. Is that a verbal smoke screen? We are up against it for money, and every other country is looking to us to help them out. We are passing appropriations without scarcely a thought, and we are voting away the peoples' money. The cost of building a mile of this road would build six comfortable homes for people. The figures I have given to the committee I have taken the trouble to glean from the Bureau of Roads. I think the gentleman has been very clever, I think he has given me honest figures, and I believe they can be verified if any Member wishes to do so. I have nothing against the good roads' proposition, but I am talking about adding appropriations to the large balance which remains unexpended.

Mr. ASWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DUNN. I decline to yield. Everyone knows that arrangements can be made to take up this matter later on. We do not need to do it in the short session. It is a poor scheme to keep passing these large appropriations without waiting to see whether they are really necessary or not.

I respectfully submit that this measure should not be passed at this time. I have no false idea about how this will be treated, but I did want to express my opinion of the matter before it was finally closed. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DUNN], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Roads, has the right to take any position he sees fit. He has done exactly what every member of that committee expected him to do. He has voted against road building every time, although he is on the Roads Committee. He did not preside at the meetings of that committee when this bill was reported. He has been bitterly opposed to road building, and his statements are incorrect when it comes to the fact of the matter. If this appropriation, this bill, does not pass this House now, 26 States of this Union will be forced to suspend road building at the end of this fiscal year, and everyone who has investigated honestly knows that to be the fact.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has expired.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, this calls for a further appropriation from the Federal Treasury, although it is only an authorization in this bill. I have yet to hear a single argument advanced why this legislation can not wait. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ASWELL] says that 26 States will fail to get any benefit of this unless it is passed this year. The gentleman from Louisiana knows that there is not a single one of those 26 States whose legislatures may not be in session during the next year.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman does not mean to misquote me, does he?

Mr. WALSH. I do not.

Mr. ASWELL. I said the 26 States would exhaust their present funds at the end of this fiscal year.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman said that 26 States would have to stop road building.

Mr. ASWELL. Precisely, and I still say so.

Mr. WALSH. Oh, yes; they will have to stop road building unless Uncle Sam goes into the Treasury and helps them out, and you will find that there is not a governor of any of the States who will not call a special session of the legislature if there is a chance to get into the Federal Treasury for funds, because they always take opportunity to do that. Where are those 26 States? Name some of them.

Mr. ASWELL. Louisiana is one of them.

Mr. WALSH. Yes; Louisiana is one, and probably Texas is another, probably Georgia another, and perhaps Florida another—Florida, which has participated to the extent of 16 per cent under the existing law. I say that when we come to appropriate \$100,000,000 in one lump we ought to give more consideration to it than can be given under a suspension of the rules; and, furthermore, that this can well wait.

If this bill passes, its most earnest advocates have no expectation of its becoming a law before the 4th of March. It will probably have to come in here again and be reconsidered by a committee and again passed by this House. I was opposed to the original law, but I am willing to admit that some of the arguments I advanced against that law were not well balanced and that benefit has come from road building under Federal auspices and Federal participation. I submit we ought to proceed to use up the money unexpended and unallotted to complete these contracts that are outstanding and wait until we know a little more about where we are going to be with our finances and where we are to get the money to continue this work before we authorize another \$100,000,000 appropriation.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. I believe you will find—

Mr. REED of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH (continuing). That if you get the facts that the States have already appropriated vast sums of money for road construction, and that some of the States, particularly the ones who bear the heavy burdens of taxation, will continue to build roads whether the Federal Treasury contributes or not, and that the time is here for us to practice a little economy instead of rising on the floor here and preaching it and calling attention to it. Here is a chance to save \$100,000,000, which we can if we do not pass this bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. No; I decline to yield.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DUNN] seems to me in the very able statement he has made to have covered the situation very well, indeed. I think ample appropriations still remain unallotted under the good-roads law. One hundred million dollars may perhaps look small in comparison to the other expenses that we are involving this country in from day to day, but I submit that to-day that \$100,000,000 can well be saved on this particular appropriation. The members of the Committee on Ways and Means are sitting continuously to find money to finance this Government, and it is just such appropriations as these that are continually troubling the Treasury. There is one feature that the gentleman from New York did not bring out. If we appropriate \$100,000,000 under this bill, it means that much more appropriations in the States, and it means that a form of tax-exempt securities would be offered to the people of the country. The municipal security being tax exempt is troublesome enough now, and it permits the tax dodger to invest his large income. It seems to me that feature alone ought to prevent the passage of this bill at this time.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I have only two minutes.

Mr. BLANTON. I have not any. [Laughter.]

Mr. TREADWAY. The gentleman has a good deal of time always on the floor.

Mr. BLANTON. I sit here and deserve it.

Mr. TREADWAY. The gentleman has ample—

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SELLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSON].

Mr. ROBSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, the bill under consideration authorizes an appropriation of \$100,000,000 to aid the several States of the Union in the construction of good roads.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], who has just preceded me in opposition to this bill, says that this ap-

propriation for good roads should wait. A few minutes ago some Members from New York and Massachusetts were urging the Members of this House to authorize a payment to the railroads of the country of more than \$300,000,000, and told us that the railroads could not wait. My friend Mr. WALSH, who opposes this measure, voted for the railroad bill. I voted against it. The railroads could not wait. They had to have three hundred millions now. [Applause.]

Mr. SNYDER. They need it.

Mr. ROBSON of Kentucky. I insist that we vote this one hundred million for roads. It will reach every home in America and do good to all people. [Applause.] This House can not follow the leadership on the question of roads of our distinguished friend from New York [Mr. DUNN], who is the chairman of our Committee on Roads. As I understand him, he is now and has always been opposed to the proposition of Federal aid for roads. He is against this bill. He is the only member of our Committee on Roads who is opposed to Federal aid for roads, and he is opposed to this bill. If every member of the Roads Committee entertained his views, there would be no necessity of a road committee in the House of Representatives, because the committee would never bring out a road bill.

Our distinguished chairman in his speech says that this appropriation for roads is not needed, as there is now in the Treasury more money than can be used within the next two years. His statements are very misleading, and he is very much in error. This appropriation should be made now, and if it is not made at the present session of Congress the road work of the Nation will be greatly crippled. The National Highway Association's representatives and others who appeared before our committee urged action at this session. My own State of Kentucky urges action now.

About 93 cents out of every dollar of the billions that are appropriated by Congress go to pay for past wars and the maintenance of the Army and Navy. About 1 cent out of every dollar goes for the construction of good roads. Some gentlemen would deny to the American people this 1 cent out of each dollar of the taxes paid in by them to help build good roads. I insist upon this appropriation because it will do more good to more people and will be of greater service to all the people than any money spent by the Federal Government. It means better farms, better schools, better farmers, better churches, better homes, and better citizens. [Applause.]

Mr. SELLS. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ALMON].

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Speaker, national aid to roads is now an adopted national policy. Both Democratic and Republican Parties in their recent platforms declared for a continuation of liberal appropriations for the road building of this country. The Committee on Roads, of which I am a member, held extensive hearings on this bill and it comes before the House under a unanimous report. Every Member of this House who is really in favor of national aid to road building ought to vote for this bill, because the \$100,000,000 authorized will be needed the next fiscal year to carry on road construction. I do not expect Members of this House who are opposed to national aid to roads to vote for this bill. They did not so vote in 1916 when we passed the first bill on this subject, but the American people, as shown by the expression of their representatives in the two great national platforms in 1920 and in many other ways, believe in this policy of national aid to roads.

All of the States have availed themselves of national appropriation—31 States by direct appropriation and 17 through counties. Forty-one State legislatures will have adjourned before the 15th of next month. It is important that this bill pass in order that those States may know what provision to make in reference to road funds. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SELLS. I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, the Republican platform adopted at Chicago has a paragraph which begins as follows:

We favor liberal appropriations in connection with the States in the construction of highways.

I consider it my duty when the opportunity arises to help carry out the pledges of my party. [Applause.] We make no appropriation in this bill. We simply carry in the bill an authorization that we have been making for a number of years past. My hope is that it will not be necessary to make any considerable appropriation during this Congress. It is probable, however, that some few States, perhaps half a dozen, have so very nearly used up their allotment that it may be necessary to make something of an appropriation in order to allow those

States to continue their development. Having started on this development of highways in cooperation with the States, it is our duty, under the pledges of the platforms of both parties, to continue it, and I hope that the gentlemen who think that \$750,000,000 or \$800,000,000 a year is not too much for Military and Naval Establishments will not find that they can not in good faith vote for this sum for a real work of construction. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I believe I have one minute, which I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MOORE].

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, in line with what the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] has just said, I could show, if time permitted, that while at the beginning of the next calendar year there will remain unexpended and unpledged a balance of the \$275,000,000 heretofore appropriated, the matter can not be looked at in solido, but must be looked at from the point of view of the several States, where the conditions of construction and contract for construction greatly vary. All of the money has, of course, been allocated.

The vital fact is that unless this appropriation is made, in some States work or the negotiation of contracts will be halted, because they have already absorbed their allocations by actual expenditures or contracts to which expenditures have been pledged. Those States are Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, and Illinois. Other States have gone so far in absorbing their allocations that they will be compelled to let up on contracts during the first half of the next fiscal year in the absence of an appropriation. Some of those States are Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Connecticut, and Louisiana.

I may say to my distinguished friend from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] that unless we make the appropriation the State of Massachusetts, so far as Federal aid is concerned, will be put in a doubtful position by about the 1st of October next.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Shall the House suspend the rules and pass the bill?

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that, in the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds had voted in the affirmative.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The House proceeded to divide.

Mr. ASWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 278, nays 58, not voting 93, as follows:

YEAS—278.

Ackerman	Darrow	Holland	Mansfield
Almon	Davis, Minn.	Howard	Mapes
Anderson	Davis, Tenn.	Huddleston	Martin
Anthony	Denison	Hudspeth	Mays
Aswell	Dewalt	Hull, Iowa	Mead
Bankhead	Dickinson, Iowa	Hull, Tenn.	Michener
Barbour	Dickinson, Mo.	Humphreys	Miller
Barkley	Dominick	Igoe	Milligan
Bee	Doremus	Ireland	Minahan, N. J.
Begg	Doughton	Jacoway	Monahan, Wis.
Bell	Dowell	James, Va.	Mondell
Benham	Drane	Jeffers	Montague
Benson	Drewry	Johnson, Miss.	Moore, Ohio
Black	Dunbar	Johnson, S. Dak.	Moore, Va.
Bland, Ind.	Dupré	Johnson, Wash.	Murphy
Bland, Va.	Eagle	Jones, Pa.	Nelson, Mo.
Bianton	Echols	Jones, Tex.	Newton, Minn.
Boies	Elliott	Juul	Newton, Mo.
Bowers	Elston	Kearns	Nicholls
Bowling	Esch	Keller	O'Connor
Box	Evans, Mont.	Kelly, Pa.	Ogden
Brand	Evans, Nebr.	Kendall	Oldfield
Briggs	Evans, Nev.	Kettner	Oliver
Brinson	Fairfield	Kless	Osborne
Britten	Ferris	King	Padgett
Brooks, Ill.	Fess	Kinkaid	Park
Browne	Fields	Klecza	Parrish
Buchanan	Fisher	Knudson	Peters
Butler	Flood	Lampert	Porter
Byrnes, S. C.	Fordney	Langley	Pou
Byrnes, Tenn.	Foster	Lanham	Purnell
Caldwell	Frear	Lankford	Quin
Campbell, Kans.	Fuller	Larsen	Rainey, Ala.
Campbell, Pa.	Garner	Lazaro	Rainey, Henry T.
Cannon	Garrett	Lee, Calif.	Raker
Cantrill	Godwin, N. C.	Lee, Ga.	Ramsey
Caraway	Goodykoontz	Linthicum	Ramseyer
Carss	Graham, Ill.	Little	Randall, Wis.
Carter	Green, Iowa	Longworth	Ransley
Christopherson	Griest	Luhning	Rayburn
Clark, Mo.	Hadley	McArthur	Reavis
Cleary	Hamilton	McClintic	Reber
Coady	Hardy, Colo.	McDuffie	Reed, W. Va.
Cole	Hardy, Tex.	McFadden	Rhodes
Collier	Hastings	McKenzie	Ricketts
Connally	Hawley	McKeown	Riddick
Cooper	Hayden	McKinley	Robison, Ky.
Copley	Hays	McLaughlin, Mich.	Rosenberg
Crago	Hernandez	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Romjue
Cramton	Hersey	McLeod	Rose
Crisp	Hersman	McPherson	Rouse
Cullen	Hickey	Madden	Rowan
Curry, Calif.	Hoch	Major	Ruby

Rucker
Sanders, La.
Schall
Scott
Sears
Sells
Shreve
Sims
Sinclair
Sinnott
Sisson
Slomp
Small
Smith, Idaho
Smith, Ill.
Smith, Mich.
Smithwick

Steagall
Stedman
Steele
Steenerson
Stephens, Miss.
Stephens, Ohio
Stevenson
Stoll
Strong, Kans.
Strong, Pa.
Sullivan
Summers, Wash.
Summers, Tex.
Sweet
Swindall
Swope
Taylor, Colo.

Taylor, Tenn.
Temple
Thompson
Tillman
Timberlake
Tinscher
Townner
Upshaw
Vail
Vare
Venable
Vestal
Vinson
Voigt
Voistead
Watkins
Watson

NAYS—58.

Andrews, Nebr.
Bacharach
Burdick
Burroughs
Crowther
Dale
Dallinger
Dunn
Dyer
Eagan
Fish
Freeman
Gallivan
Glynn
Good

Greene, Mass.
Greene, Vt.
Griffin
Hicks
Houghton
Husted
Kennedy, R. I.
Kraus
Layton
Luce
Lufkin
McAndrews
MacGregor
Magee
Mann, Ill.

Mason
Merritt
Moore, Ind.
Mott
Olney
Paige
Parker
Pell
Phelan
Reed, N. Y.
Rogers
Rowe
Sanders, N. Y.
Sherwood
Siegel

NOT VOTING—93.

Andrews, Md.
Ashbrook
Ayres
Babka
Baer
Blackmon
Bland, Mo.
Brooks, Pa.
Brumbaugh
Burke
Candler
Carew
Casey
Chindblom
Clark, Fla.
Clason
Costello
Currie, Mich.
Davey
Dempsey
Dent
Donovan
Dooling
Edmonds

Ellsworth
Emerson
Focht
French
Gallagher
Gandy
Ganly
Gard
Goldfogle
Goodall
Goodwin, Ark.
Gould
Graham, Pa.
Hamill
Harrell
Harrison
Haugen
Hill
Hoey
Hulings
Hutchinson
James, Mich.
Johnson, Ky.
Johnston, N. Y.

Kahn
Kelley, Mich.
Kennedy, Iowa
Kincheloe
Kitchen
Kreider
Lehlbach
Leshner
Lonerger
McCulloch
McGlennan
McKiniry
McLane
Maher
Mann, S. C.
Moon
Mooney
Morin
Mudd
Neely
Nelson, Wis.
Nolan
O'Connell
Overstreet

So (two-thirds having voted in the affirmative) the rules were suspended, and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs.

On the vote:

Mr. CHINDBLUM and Mr. FRENCH (for) with Mr. LEHLBACH (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. HARRELD with Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas.

Mr. WOODYARD with Mr. NEELY.

Mr. YATES with Mr. AYRES.

Mr. COSTELLO with Mr. THOMAS.

Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa with Mr. GANLY.

Mr. WALTERS with Mr. CASEY.

Mr. DEMPSEY with Mr. BLAND of Missouri.

Mr. PERLMAN with Mr. WHALEY.

Mr. HUTCHINSON with Mr. MAHER.

Mr. MORIN with Mr. JOHNSTON of New York.

Mr. FOCHT with Mr. DONOVAN.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan with Mr. HAMILL.

Mr. HAUGEN with Mr. GOLDFOGLE.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania with Mr. GALLAGHER.

Mr. EDMONDS with Mr. LONERGAN.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, am I recorded?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is not recorded.

Mr. ESCH. I wish to vote.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman present in the Hall, listening?

Mr. ESCH. I was.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the gentleman's name.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. ESCH, and he voted "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. SELLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the bill may have five days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the bill may have five days in which to revise and extend their remarks. Is there objection?

Mr. MADDEN. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

ABANDONMENT OF CAMP FUNSTON.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the rules be suspended and House resolution 625 be passed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas moves that the rules be suspended and House resolution 625 be passed.

Mr. SNELL. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask what that proposition is.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolution (H. Res. 625) requesting the War Department to furnish information to the Committee on Military Affairs regarding the abandonment of Camp Funston and providing that pending the furnishing of such information and action thereon that no action toward the wrecking and abandonment of said camp be taken.

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, requested to delay such movement of troops from Camp Funston as to cause the abandonment of said camp and not to cause the removal or destruction of any of the buildings or improvements at Camp Funston prior to June 30, 1921; and it is further requested to submit to the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives all the facts and information upon which the War Department based its decision to abandon Camp Funston and to remove the troops to other camps.

Resolved further, That the Secretary of War is hereby requested to inform said Committee on Military Affairs of the specific reasons why said camp is to be abandoned and the reasons for the necessity for its abandonment at this time; also what the intentions of said department are regarding the buildings and improvements at said camp, and if it is the decision of the War Department to wreck said camp, or any part thereof, and the intention of the War Department as to the policy and manner which the equipment, buildings, and material of said camp, if wrecked, are to be disposed of.

Resolved further, That the Secretary of War is hereby requested to furnish the Committee on Military Affairs information regarding the present capacity of the camps to which the troops ordered removed from Camp Funston are to be stationed and whether or not the stationing of such troops at such camps will require additional improvements at said camps.

Resolved further, That pending the furnishing of said information herein requested to the Committee on Military Affairs, and until consideration and action shall be taken by said committee and the Congress of the United States, that no action shall be taken by the War Department toward the wrecking, destruction, removal, or disposition of Camp Funston or any of the buildings or improvements at said camp.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, Camp Funston was one of the great camps at which the Seventh, Tenth, and Eighty-ninth Divisions were trained during the war. It is located within 5 miles of the geographical center of the United States. It is situated on a Government-owned reservation of 20,000 acres, 16,000 acres of which are rolling prairie, where troops may be drilled and maneuvered at all seasons of the year. This camp and entire reservation is drained by the Kansas River, which runs through its southern border. The great transcontinental route of the Union Pacific Railroad Co. runs through this camp. During the war and after the location of the camp the railroad company constructed 22 miles of double track to connect with the Missouri, Kansas & Texas Railroad, running south toward Mexico. About 20 miles of sidetracks were constructed in order to make the entrainment of troops prompt and efficient. During the war from 150,000 to 200,000 troops were trained at this camp.

When this camp was constructed it was planned to make it a permanent camp, and buildings, consisting of about 1,215 in number, were constructed on cement foundations. Hard-surfaced roads, electric light, water, sewer, and telephone systems were built, all costing millions of dollars. After the war was over and during last summer a great deal of money was spent in developing a camp school there and in reroofing many of the buildings and in improving them and fitting the camp as division headquarters for the Seventh Division.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Is this a joint resolution or simply a House resolution?

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. This is a House resolution.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. I will.

Mr. BLANTON. Have the hearings on this resolution been printed?

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. I do not know about that. The resolution was reported unanimously by the Military Affairs Committee.

Mr. BLANTON. Are there any hearings on it?

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. I appeared before the committee and presented the facts and statements and evidence which had been placed in my possession.

Mr. BLANTON. Was anybody else heard on it?

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Yes; I think some members of the committee who had knowledge of the facts addressed the committee. Mr. HULL of Iowa appeared in behalf of the camp at Fort Dodge, Iowa.

Mr. WALSH. I am not talking about the Fort Dodge one. I am talking about the Kansas one.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. I do not think there was anyone else there but myself and the committee.

Mr. BLANTON. Was the letter from the War Department filed with the hearings?

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. I think it was. After the resolution was sent to the War Department the clerk of the committee sent me a copy of the letter received in reply, which I received several days before the hearing.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Do I understand the gentleman to say there were 1,800 buildings at this camp which had cement foundations?

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Over 1,200 buildings; 1,215, I think.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Did the other cantonments throughout the United States have cement foundations?

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. I do not know.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Have the buildings in the other cantonments had reroofing done on them?

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. I do not know as to that. But a great deal of money was spent last summer on these buildings at Camp Funston, and this camp has cost the Government many millions of dollars, as it was supposed it was to be a permanent camp; but on the 1st of December, 1920, the War Department issued an order to wreck the camp and remove the troops.

A protest was of no avail, and this resolution was introduced and the facts presented to the Committee on Military Affairs, which reported unanimously in favor of the resolution after adding an amendment requesting the War Department to defer the wrecking of the camp until June 1, for the reason that they have a committee which is making an examination of all camps, and they felt—and I hope the House will feel—that this great camp should not be wrecked until the Committee on Military Affairs shall have had an opportunity to examine all the facts and make some recommendation to the House regarding all the Army camps. If they are to be wrecked, then they should be wrecked in such a way that the Government would derive the largest amount of money therefrom.

Mr. McKENZIE and Mr. BEGG rose.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. I will yield first to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BEGG].

Mr. BEGG. Can the gentleman tell us the reason the War Department gave for abandoning this camp?

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. They gave no good reason, other than they thought the troops should be brought to Camp Meade to be close to the Capitol—I suppose, because they felt we needed some protection.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Yes; I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McKENZIE. Is it not a fact that Camp Funston is located on the Fort Riley Reservation?

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. It is.

Mr. McKENZIE. It is the great cavalry school of our Military Establishment?

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. It is.

Mr. McKENZIE. And is it not a further fact that the War Department has divided the country into corps areas, and that in each one of these corps areas a great cantonment is being reserved as a drill ground for the National Guard and such Regular troops as may be in that area, and in this particular area they selected Camp Pike, in the State of Arkansas, and that it is a question yet to be determined by the Committee on Military Affairs whether it will be a part of wisdom to retain Camp Pike or Camp Funston as now located on a military reservation?

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. I think those are the facts. But inasmuch as the War Department only last summer seemed to think that Camp Funston should be retained, and they expended a great amount of money there, and then, as I said, on the 1st of December decided to abandon and wreck it, it seems to me that this House should take this action and stop any wreckage of the camp until the committee should make investigation and report. I have been against a large Army and have always voted for retrenchment and economy. I am not asking in this resolution to retain Camp Funston as a permanent camp. I am only asking that it shall not be wrecked until a committee of this House has an opportunity to examine into

all the facts and conditions and decide what is the best thing to be done with all the Army camps. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GREENE] 10 minutes.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, it is many years since the Congress or the country has had anything like a detailed inventory of the real estate holdings of the War Department, maintained for the purposes of the Military Establishment. Previous to the World War the military activities were not sufficiently conspicuous or extensive, perhaps, to cause much public interest or concern in this detail; but we are all familiar with the history of the legislation and the policies of the War Department during the World War and the fact that under blanket appropriations and under various other forms of authorization the War Department has from time to time acquired miscellaneous pieces of real estate and various other properties scattered from one end of the country to the other, all of which are now being maintained by one degree or another of expensive overhead in the supposed interest of the Military Establishment. This, it is needless to suggest to you, has resulted in piling up an aggregate overhead of maintenance expense for the Military Establishment since the war that is in no wise comparable with the usual normal expense of that kind under prewar conditions.

The Committee on Military Affairs some time ago authorized the subcommittee of which my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCKENZIE], is chairman to make a careful survey and inventory of all real estate, camp sites, forts, and other properties of that kind held by the War Department for the use of the Military Establishment in every part of the country. That subcommittee is now proceeding in its work by making a thorough canvass of all these holdings in each one of the nine corps areas into which our continental United States is now divided.

We are attempting to bring together by this careful survey and inventory such figures as will for the first time in many years inform the House and the Congress as to just the character, kind, and extent of military properties of this nature this country now possesses. We further hope to be able to recommend to the House, after we have concluded this survey, what parts of this property may well be abandoned or turned to other uses in order to reduce in an economical and at the same time a practical way this enormous overhead for the maintenance of the Military Establishment.

It is because this survey is now under way that the Military Committee has felt justified in asking the Secretary of War temporarily to retain Camp Funston, which is covered by this House resolution 625, and Fort Dodge, which is covered by another House resolution soon to be brought to your attention. We simply ask that the action of the War Department in disposing of or wrecking this property shall be stayed until the subcommittee can look into the situation in connection with its general survey of all similar properties and discover and recommend to the House what in its own judgment is the better one, two, or three, or whatever the number may be of the properties, to be retained for the permanent use of the Military Establishment in each corps area. It is intended to be a simple, businesslike inventory and survey, with the idea of bringing things down to a practical business basis.

Mr. JUUL. Will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Certainly.

Mr. JUUL. What will be the effect of the request for delay coming from the House?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. It depends, of course, on whether this passes or not. The War Department does not seem to take hints.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Vermont has expired.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. May I have two minutes more?

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman two minutes more.

Mr. STEVENSON. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Certainly.

Mr. STEVENSON. Are there any other camps that are being dismantled in the same way in which these two are?

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. None have been brought officially to the attention of the committee, nor has any action to my knowledge been asked upon any other than these two.

If the House will indulge me just a moment further, I only want to suggest this one thing: The other day I offered an observation on the floor to this effect, that the so-called burden of "militarism" which some of our friends seem to think is confronting our country is by no means caused by the expense of maintaining the soldiers in the Regular Army.

It is largely caused by certain activities and overheads of interior administration within the War Department and the

Military Establishment; but, unfortunately, the expense of these overheads and these activities being totaled with the cost of the pay and maintenance of the soldiers, the total is so alarmingly large that some of our friends divide this amount by the number of soldiers, and they say, as a result of their arithmetic, that the cost of the maintenance of a soldier is so much per capita. As a matter of fact, I am sure you will all discover that there are other sources of expense creeping into this thing, and if we could eliminate all that are not practicable, useful, and profitable under the circumstances, it would by so much reduce what is thus called the per capita cost of maintaining the personnel of the Army. That is why the other day I tried to remind gentlemen on the floor that it was mistaken economy to cut off the number of men in the Army, thereby expecting materially to reduce the total expense. It is the wrong way to treat it. It is the wrong principle to invoke, and it only succeeds in making an inefficient and unworkable Army so far as its numbers are concerned.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, the great question that the American people are continually propounding to Congress is, When is the Congress of the United States going to put this country back to normal and on a peace basis? Every time you go to one of the departments and ask them why they do not help us put the country back on a peace basis their reply immediately is, "Every time we try, we must cut from some Congressman something that he wants carried on with respect either to his constituency or his district. We have either got to discharge some of his constituents or we have got to take something out of his district for which the country is spending money. Every time we try to do that, that Congressman comes in and stops us. He will not let us discharge the surplus clerks and employees, because they are his constituents. He will not let us stop this expenditure of money in his district, because his people want it spent there and carried on month after month to get the benefit of it." We all know that the Secretary of War wants an Army of 500,000 men. I do not agree with him and Congress does not agree with him. We have tried to reduce his large Army ideas. Against my vote the majority placed the maximum of the Army in a bill at 280,000 when I wanted it 100,000, and the Secretary of War has been trying to recruit men up to that maximum and now has 237,000 men.

But even with his idea of 280,000 men in the Army he has been trying to retrench in some other ways, because early in January he ordered Camp Funston dismantled and ordered the men brought away, because he wanted to stop the expenses going on down there. The Government has already spent \$800,000 sending men there, bringing them back, sending them back and forth and forth and back, and the Secretary of War is seeking to stop it.

As soon as he ordered Camp Funston dismantled and the men taken away, we find the Kansas Representative [Mr. STRONG], in the pockets of whose constituents there will be some emptiness when the money is stopped being spent there, rushing in with a resolution that has about 15 "whereases" in it, and he goes before the erstwhile great Military Affairs Committee and seeks to have the Secretary of War's order set aside, and on his own unsupported statement gets the committee to report out his resolution without any further hearing. He is putting his interests or the financial interests of his constituents against the solemn judgment of the War Department in trying to stop the expenses of the War Department.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I will.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. We have heard a great deal of the solemn judgment of the War Department, and we thought it was right to withhold this until we have some solemn judgment on it ourselves.

Mr. BLANTON. When the judgment of the War Department is good I follow it, and when it is bad I do not.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. We are trying to determine some things for ourselves, and not taking the judgment of the War Department until we do.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. How does this resolution withhold action by the War Department? Is not this a simple House resolution?

Mr. BLANTON. In my judgment it will not have any effect on the Secretary of War at all. It would take some joint action by the Senate also.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I have wondered in passing the House resolution, which the President can not veto, if we could thereby accomplish more than we could accomplish by passing a bill through the House and the Senate and then sending it to the President, which he could veto? If we can legislate

without giving the President a chance to veto, we ought to have tried that the other day. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. I agree with the gentleman, because his judgment is sound. I was discussing the foolish side of the resolution in order to show the foolish policy of the Republican side of the House. I want to show what a foolish policy my friends over there have. If the Secretary of War will not pay any attention to the solemn piece of legislation passed by the House and the Senate and signed by the President, whereby we directed him through our appropriation to cut the Army down to 175,000 men, and he is still recruiting it up to 280,000, what attention is he going to pay to a simple House resolution? He will probably throw it in the wastebasket, if he pursues his former way of carrying out his own ideas.

But he also decided that it was for the good of the country to take the troops away from Fort Dodge, Iowa, and dismantle that camp, to retrench expenses, and get back to normal. As soon as he sought to do that you find the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOWELL] coming in here with a similar resolution with a lot more of whereases, going before the committee and saying you must stop the Secretary of War; it is Democratic money being spent in a Republican district, and our Republicans there must get the benefit of it. The committee without any hearings, without giving the War Department a chance to come before it, and give their side of it, and show that the War Department had good judgment in the matter and good reason for this proposed retrenchment—the committee reported the resolution out. Our distinguished Speaker did not like to do this, but he is carrying out the policy of the steering committee to stop public money from being taken away from the Republican districts, and he agreed to recognize these gentlemen to move to suspend the rules and pass these House resolutions to stop the Secretary of War. That is the Republican policy under the new régime. That is not the kind of legislation that the Democracy of this country has been in the habit of passing in days gone by.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman from Texas has criticized the Secretary of War as much as anyone; what would the gentleman do? We all know that the Secretary of War is not carrying out the provisions of the law, but what would the gentleman have us do? Would he have us impeach him?

Mr. BLANTON. I know that when we have tried to apply the snickersnee on the gentleman from Wyoming's district, concerning feed for his elk, and taking his surveyors general away, the majority leader came in here and made us put these items back in the bill, which the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee had caused to be taken out. When it comes to taking money out of their districts, my friends do not want any snickersnee applied. When it comes to voting \$350,000,000 for railroads you find every Republican standing up.

Mr. GOOD. The gentleman knows that the Secretary of War is a Democrat—

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, I do not approve of everything that the Secretary of War does.

Mr. GOOD. How is Congress to curb the spirit of the Secretary of War in overriding the resolution of the last Congress? How would the gentleman stop it?

Mr. BLANTON. When it comes to the policy of fixing the size of the Army, a big thing like that, the Secretary handles it himself, but when it comes to a little item of saving millions of dollars of the people's money, he leaves that to some of his subordinate lieutenants, and his subordinate lieutenants in their wisdom have seen fit to try to save the people's money and dismantle these unnecessary camps at Funston, Kans., and Fort Dodge, Iowa, and get back to normal. When they recommend this, however, when they seek to take these men away from these camps, seek to dismantle them to save public money and get us back on a peace basis, we find our good friend from Kansas [Mr. Strong] and our good friend from Iowa [Mr. DOWELL], backed up by the economical chairman of the Committee on Appropriations [Mr. Good], coming back here and saying, "You must stop the Secretary of War, boys, because it is money spent in a Republican district and we are going to keep it."

Mr. GOOD. Oh, the gentleman is mistaken. I have never said anything of the kind. I think we ought to dismantle all of these camps that there is no need for.

Mr. BLANTON. I am not a mind reader, but I was just reciting what the gentleman had in his mind—

Mr. GOOD. Oh, the gentleman is mistaken. The gentleman was criticizing the Secretary of War, and all I had in my mind was what has been in my mind for a long time, and that is how can we stop the Secretary of War enlisting men, as he has been doing, at the rate of 1,000 a day.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, the gentleman knows how to do it if he would, but he must not get me away from the subject so far. I am discussing the economical policy of saving public money

by dismantling surplus war camps and getting back to a peace basis. Is the gentleman from Iowa in favor of getting back on a peace basis?

Mr. GOOD. Of course I am.

Mr. BLANTON. Does anyone on the Democratic side want any time from me? If not, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. McKENZIE. Oh, I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas a question.

Mr. BLANTON. Very well.

Mr. McKENZIE. I think the gentleman from Texas is unduly exercised over this matter.

Mr. BLANTON. No; I am not.

Mr. McKENZIE. The truth about it is that there is a subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs which is making a complete survey of all of the real estate owned and controlled by the Military Establishment, with the end in view of bringing a report into this Congress asking that all unnecessary real estate—

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, just a minute.

Mr. McKENZIE. Let me finish my statement.

Mr. BLANTON. That is too much of a speech. The gentleman is a lawyer and a parliamentarian, is he not?

Mr. McKENZIE. Oh, really, the gentleman flatters me too much.

Mr. BLANTON. And he knows that this little old frivolous House resolution will have no effect whatever upon the Secretary of War—a common ordinary House resolution.

Mr. McKENZIE. I might agree with the gentleman from Texas as to that if he makes it apply to the Secretary of War, but I am speaking now of the Congress. We only hope to get a chance to bring in a resolution recommending the abandonment of not only perhaps these camps but many other camps in the country.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Strong] has time and will yield to the gentleman. I yield now to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Fields] for three minutes.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Will not the gentleman from Texas yield to me for a question?

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, this resolution is pure political bunk, and that is all there is to it. It does not bind, and it can not bind, the Secretary of War to do anything. It is merely a House resolution, and we can not direct executive action by a House resolution, and no Democrat ought to vote for it and on the other side no Republican should vote for it. Gentlemen have at times criticized the War Department for extravagance, but I want to know where you are going to draw your line of consistency if on the one hand you criticize the War Department for not getting back to normalcy and then attempt to stop the Secretary of War every time he makes an effort to get back to normalcy. I suppose if every cantonment in this country was in a congressional district represented by a Republican the hands of the Secretary of War would be tied or an effort would be made to tie them every time he attempted to disband a camp.

Mr. McKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FIELDS. Just one thought before I am interrupted. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Strong] said this bill was reported unanimously. Perhaps it was. I did not happen to attend the meeting of the committee when it was reported out, but it is a proposition of political bunk for the benefit of a particular Member of Congress. I trust that no Democrat in this House will put himself in the ridiculous position of indorsing a course of that kind, and the Republican membership of the House ought not to do so, either. This resolution ought to be defeated.

On the one hand you are criticizing the War Department for its failure to retrench, and then when an effort is made to abandon a camp that the War Department deems inadvisable to retain Members are ready to vote to tie the hands of the War Department, if this resolution could do such a thing.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the gentleman from Texas to yield to me for a moment?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MONTAGUE].

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McKENZIE] a question?

Mr. McKENZIE. Certainly.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Has there been any other resolution investigating the removal or closing down of any other camps in the country except this one?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes. That is what I wanted to ask the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FIELDS]. I wanted to ask him if he did not vote last year for an extension of time to take care of Camp Gordon at Atlanta, Ga., and Camp Eustis.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Were they reported to the House?

Mr. McKENZIE. Certainly, they went through the House.

Mr. HASTINGS. Were they passed?

Mr. McKENZIE. Yes; and I think the gentleman from Kentucky voted for both of them.

Mr. FIELDS. Oh, yes; and the committee made an investigation and reported, but the gentleman knows that we are not going to keep all of the camps in the country.

Mr. McKENZIE. I hope not.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the resolution.

The question was taken.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is not. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the resolution.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 181, nays 112, answered "present" 3, not voting 133, as follows:

YEAS—181.

Ackerman	Elston	Lazaro	Rowe
Almon	Esch	Lee, Ga.	Schall
Anderson	Evans, Nebr.	Little	Scott
Andrews, Nebr.	Fess	Longworth	Sells
Anthony	Fisher	Luce	Shreve
Ayres	Foster	Luhning	Siegel
Bankhead	Frear	McDuffie	Sinclair
Barbour	Freeman	McFadden	Sinnot
Bee	Fuller	McKenzie	Slomp
Begg	Glynn	McKinley	Smith, Idaho
Bell	Green, Iowa	McLaughlin, Mich.	Smith, Mich.
Benham	Greene, Vt.	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Steagall
Bland, Ind.	Griest	McLeod	Stephens, Ohio
Bland, Va.	Griffin	McPherson	Strong, Kans.
Boies	Hadley	Madden	Strong, Pa.
Bowers	Hamilton	Magee	Summers, Wash.
Bowling	Hardy, Colo.	Mansfield	Summers, Tex.
Brand	Haugen	Mapes	Sweet
Briggs	Hawley	Merritt	Swindall
Brinson	Hernandez	Michener	Temple
Brooks, Ill.	Hersey	Miller	Thompson
Browne	Hickey	Monahan, Wis.	Tilson
Burdick	Hicks	Moore, Ohio	Timberlake
Burroughs	Hoch	Moore, Ind.	Tinkham
Butler	Howard	Mott	Towner
Caldwell	Hull, Iowa	Murphy	Upshaw
Campbell, Kans.	Husted	Newton, Minn.	Vaile
Campbell, Pa.	Ireland	Newton, Mo.	Vare
Christopherson	Johanson, Wash.	Oliver	Vestal
Cole	Juhl	Osborne	Voigt
Cooper	Kearns	Padgett	Volk
Copley	Kelley, Mich.	Paige	Volstead
Crisp	Kelly, Pa.	Peters	Webster
Crowther	Kendall	Purnell	Wheeler
Curry, Calif.	Kennedy, R. I.	Rainey, Ala.	White, Kans.
Dale	Kettner	Ramseyer	White, Me.
Dallinger	Kless	Randall, Wis.	Williams
Darrow	King	Ransley	Winslow
Dempsey	Kinkaid	Reber	Wood, Ind.
Denison	Klecka	Reed, N. Y.	Wright
Dickinson, Iowa	Knutson	Reed, W. Va.	Yates
Donovan	Lampert	Rhodes	Young, N. Dak.
Dowell	Langley	Ricketts	Zihlman
Dunbar	Lankford	Riddick	
Dyer	Layton	Rogers	
Elliott		Rose	

NAYS—112.

Aswell	Drewry	Linthicum	Sanders, N. Y.
Bacharach	Dunn	Lufkin	Sears
Barkley	Dupré	McClutic	Sims
Benson	Eagan	McKeown	Sisson
Black	Evans, Mont.	MacGregor	Smithwick
Blanton	Fairfield	Major	Stedman
Box	Fields	Mann, Ill.	Steele
Britten	Flood	Martin	Stephens, Miss.
Buchanan	Garner	Milligan	Stevenson
Byrnes, S. C.	Garrett	Minahan, N. J.	Stoll
Byrns, Tenn.	Godwin, N. C.	Montague	Swope
Cantrill	Greene, Mass.	Necly	Taylor, Ark.
Caraway	Hardy, Tex.	Nelson, Mo.	Taylor, Colo.
Carss	Hastings	O'Connor	Tillman
Carter	Hersman	Ogden	Treadway
Clark, Mo.	Houghton	Oldfield	Venable
Clary	Huddleston	Park	Vinson
Condy	Igoe	Parker	Walsh
Collier	Jacoway	Parrish	Wason
Connally	James, Va.	Pell	Watkins
Cramton	Johnson, Miss.	Phelan	Watson
Davis, Minn.	Jones, Pa.	Pou	Weaver
Davis, Tenn.	Jones, Tex.	Quin	Welling
Dewalt	Keller	Raker	Welty
Dominick	Kraus	Rayburn	Wilson, La.
Doremus	Lanham	Romjue	Wingo
Doughton	Larsen	Rouse	Woods, Va.
Drane	Lea, Calif.	Rubey	Young, Tex.

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—3.

Crago	Goodykoontz	Rucker
Andrews, Md.	Eland, Mo.	Cannon
Ashbrook	Brooks, Pa.	Carew
Bakka	Brumbaugh	Casey
Baer	Burke	Chindblom
Blackmon	Candler	Clark, Fla.

NOT VOTING—133.

Classon
Costello
Cullen
Currie, Mich.
Davey

Dent	Hays	Mann, S. C.	Rowan
Dickinson, Mo.	Hill	Mason	Sabath
Doelling	Hoey	Mays	Sanders, Ind.
Eagle	Holland	Mead	Sanders, La.
Echols	Hudspeth	Mondell	Sanford
Edmonds	Hulings	Moon	Scully
Ellsworth	Hull, Tenn.	Mooney	Sherwood
Emerson	Humphreys	Moore, Va.	Small
Evans, Nev.	Hutchinson	Morin	Smith, Ill.
Ferris	James, Mich.	Mudd	Smith, N. Y.
Focht	Jefferis	Nelson, Wis.	Snell
Fordney	Johnson, Ky.	Nicholls	Snyder
French	Johnson, S. Dak.	Nolan	Steenerson
Gallagher	Johnston, N. Y.	O'Connell	Stiness
Gallivan	Kahn	Olney	Sullivan
Gandy	Kennedy, Iowa	Overstreet	Tague
Ganly	Kincheloe	Patterson	Taylor, Tenn.
Gard	Kitchin	Periman	Thomas
Goldfogle	Kreider	Porter	Tincher
Good	Lehibach	Radcliffe	Walters
Goodall	Leshner	Rainey, Henry T.	Ward
Goodwin, Ark.	Loneragan	Rainey, John W.	Whaley
Gould	McAndrews	Ramsey	Wilson, Ill.
Graham, Ill.	McArthur	Randall, Calif.	Wilson, Pa.
Graham, Pa.	McCulloch	Reavis	Wise
Hamill	McGlennon	Riordan	Woodyard
Harrel	McKinry	Robinson, N. C.	
Harrison	McLane	Robison, Ky.	
Hayden	Maher	Rodenberg	

So, two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof, the motion to suspend the rules and pass the resolution was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. TINCHER with Mr. RUCKER.
 Mr. SNEEL with Mr. NICHOLLS.
 Mr. MONDELL with Mr. MOORE of Virginia.
 Mr. REAVIS with Mr. HUMPHREYS.
 Mr. SNYDER with Mr. HAYDEN.
 Mr. MASON with Mr. CARTER.
 Mr. GOOD with Mr. GALLIVAN.
 Mr. FORDNEY with Mr. SHERWOOD.
 Mr. RODENBERG with Mr. TAGUE.
 Mr. FOCHT with Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. STEENERSON with Mr. FERRIS.
 Mr. HARRELD with Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri.
 Mr. CHINDBLOM with Mr. HOLLAND.
 Mr. STINESS with Mr. OVERSTREET.
 Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota with Mr. OLNEY.
 Mr. PORTER with Mr. SMALL.
 Mr. FRENCH with Mr. HUDSPETH.
 Mr. WOODYARD with Mr. BAKKA.
 Mr. HILL with Mr. ROBINSON of North Carolina.
 Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois with Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY.
 Mr. WARD with Mr. McANDREWS.
 Mr. SMITH of Illinois with Mr. ROWAN.
 Mr. RAMSEY with Mr. SULLIVAN.
 Mr. CANNON with Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky.
 Mr. LEHLBACH with Mr. MEAD.
 Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee with Mr. O'CONNELL.
 Mr. ECHOLS with Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas.
 Mr. McARTHUR with Mr. HULL of Tennessee.
 Mr. ROBSON of Kentucky with Mr. MAYS.
 Mr. JEFFERIS with Mr. CULLEN.
 Mr. HAYS with Mr. BRUMBAUGH.
 Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I want to change my vote from "no" to "present." I am paired.

The name of Mr. RUCKER was called, and he answered "Present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALSH). A quorum is present; the Doorkeeper will open the doors.

The doors were opened.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT CALENDAR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next bill on the Unanimous Consent Calendar.

LEASING OF HOSPITALS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was House joint resolution 411, authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to enter into an agreement to lease or to execute lease for hospitals acquired or to be constructed by the State of New York or other States of the United States of America for the care and treatment of beneficiaries of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, that subject having been covered by the resolution passed to-day, I wish to withdraw it.

Mr. WINGO. Is this resolution identical in its terms to the bill that was brought up under suspension?

Mr. LANGLEY. Section 1 of this resolution was omitted in the bill passed to-day.

Mr. WINGO. What about the other sections?

Mr. LANGLEY. The committee does not care to press section 2.

Mr. WINGO. What is section 2?

Mr. LANGLEY. It provides for general cooperation between all the States and the Federal Government on the same plan provided in section 1 for New York State.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the motion is not in order, it not being an item in that bill. It is not in order.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, then I object to the consideration of House joint resolution 411.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky objects, and the Clerk will report the next bill.

PAROLE AND PROBATION SYSTEM, UNITED STATES COURTS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 14136) to amend an act entitled "An act to parole United States prisoners, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1910, as amended by an act approved January 23, 1913, and for the establishment of a probation system in the United States courts, except in the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, may we have the bill reported?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection the Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk proceeded to read the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. HUSTED. Will the gentleman withhold his objection?

Mr. BLANTON. I thought we would save time. There are several more pages. I object in order to save time.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill H. R. 14136.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York is not recognized for that purpose.

Mr. SIEGEL. I wanted to say, Mr. Speaker, that I had an understanding with the Speaker—

Mr. WINGO. I object. These gentlemen's agreements are contrary to the rules.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point that there is no quorum, then.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York makes the point of no quorum. The Chair will count.

The Chair proceeded to count.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of no quorum.

CHOCTAW AND CHICKASAW SANATORIUM, TALIHINA, OKLA.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 12157) to amend act of Congress approved June 30, 1913.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 12157) to amend act of Congress approved June 30, 1913.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I think, Mr. Speaker, where a bill has no more title than this it ought to be reported to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of Congress approved June 30, 1913 (38 Stat. L.), authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to reserve and set aside four sections of the unallotted lands belonging to the Choctaw and Chickasaw Tribes of Indians in Oklahoma, for the purpose of providing land on which to build a sanatorium or sanatoria for the benefit of the Indians, is hereby amended to provide that the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to sell at the original appraisal value, and convey to the State of Oklahoma a portion of this reserve not now used nor may be needed for the proper operation of the tribal institutions thereon, and as may be agreed upon by the Secretary of the Interior and the State health commissioner, not to exceed one section of said reserve, for the purpose of providing a site on which the State shall build sanatoria for the treatment of both white and Indian citizens of said State.

Also the following committee amendment was read:

On page 2, line 1, after the word "used," strike out the words "nor may be" and insert the word "or."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, in cases of this kind I think it has been quite customary to provide that the title shall revert to the United States if the land is not used for the purpose indicated. Can the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTER] give information as to how definite the proposition of the State of Oklahoma is in this connection?

Mr. CARTER. If the gentleman will notice, this is Indian land and not public land. The health authorities of the State of Oklahoma have provided for a sanatorium to be erected on 640 acres of land somewhere in this community. This is about the

only available land, the title to all the other Indian lands having passed to private ownership.

Mr. CRAMTON. Has the erection of such an institution been authorized and money appropriated?

Mr. CARTER. Oh, no. This simply authorizes the sale of the land to the State, the State to pay the Indians for the lands at the appraised value.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman did not understand my question. Has the erection of the institution by the State been authorized by the legislature?

Mr. CARTER. It has.

Mr. CRAMTON. And the money has been appropriated by the legislature?

Mr. CARTER. The money has been appropriated and they are ready now to go to work.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk will report the bill for amendment.

The bill was again reported.

The committee amendment was also reported.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill as amended.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. CARTER, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

COAL AND ASPHALT DEPOSITS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 15011) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to offer for sale the remainder of the coal and asphalt deposits in segregated mineral land in the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations, State of Oklahoma.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to offer for sale under rules and regulations to be prescribed by him the remainder of the coal and asphalt deposits in the segregated mineral land in the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations in the State of Oklahoma.

Also the following committee amendment was read:

Page 1, beginning with line 4, strike out the following language: "offer for sale under rules and regulations to be prescribed by him the remainder of the coal and asphalt deposits in the segregated mineral land in the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations in the State of Oklahoma."

And insert in lieu thereof the following:

Reappraise and offer for sale the remainder of the segregated coal and asphalt deposits in the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations in the State of Oklahoma, under rules and regulations to be prescribed by him in accordance with the act of February 8, 1918 (U. S. Stat. L. 40, p. 433), as to terms and conditions of payment; and the unexpended balance appropriated by said act of February 8, 1918, is hereby reapportioned and authorized to be expended out of the Choctaw and Chickasaw tribal funds for this purpose.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The bill was read for amendment, with a committee amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 4, strike out the words "offer for sale under rules and regulations to be prescribed by him the remainder of the coal and asphalt deposits in the segregated mineral land in the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations in the State of Oklahoma," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "Reappraise and offer for sale the remainder of the segregated coal and asphalt deposits in the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations in the State of Oklahoma, under rules and regulations to be prescribed by him in accordance with the act of February 8, 1918 (40 U. S. Stat. L., p. 433), as to terms and conditions of payment; and the unexpended balance appropriated by said act of February 8, 1918, is hereby reapportioned and authorized to be expended out of the Choctaw and Chickasaw tribal funds for this purpose."

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the amendment is not in order. I must say I am rather surprised that the Committee on Indian Affairs would bring in an amendment appropriating money, when the Committee on Indian Affairs has had so much to say about the new rule. [Laughter.]

Mr. CARTER. Well, I will state to the gentleman—

The SPEAKER. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. CARTER. Of course, it is subject to a point of order. I will offer an amendment to authorize it.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The Chair has sustained the point of order. Otherwise I might have withdrawn it.

Mr. CARTER. I was in hopes the gentleman would withdraw it. Will the gentleman withdraw it?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. It is too late. It has been sustained.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend by eliminating the objectionable word "reappropriated," on line 5 of page 2, and striking out the word "expended," in line 6, and inserting the word "appropriated." If the gentleman from Illinois has any objection to that, I would like to leave it subject to his suggestion.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CARTER: Page 2, line 5, strike out the word "reappropriated," and, in line 6, strike out the word "expended" and insert in lieu thereof the word "appropriated."

Mr. MANN of Illinois. That has all gone out.

The SPEAKER. Yes. The committee amendment has all gone out. The gentleman will have to offer a new amendment.

Mr. CARTER. The language to which the gentleman makes objection—

Mr. MANN of Illinois. No; I made a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. CARTER. The entire amendment?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. CARTER. What I offer is the exact language stricken out with the changes I have suggested. Mr. Speaker, may we have the Clerk read it that way? That was the amendment I offered.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The Clerk may know what the gentleman intends to do, but I am free to say I do not.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CARTER: Page 1, line 3, after the word "authorized," strike out all of lines 4, 5, 6, and 7 down to and including the word "Oklahoma," and insert in lieu thereof the following language: "reappraise and offer for sale the remainder of the segregated coal and asphalt deposits in the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations in the State of Oklahoma, under rules and regulations to be prescribed by him in accordance with the act of February 8, 1918 (U. S. Stats. L., 40, p. 433), as to terms and conditions of payment; and the unexpended balance appropriated by said act of February 8, 1918, is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of the Choctaw and Chickasaw tribal funds for this purpose."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the Chair permit a parliamentary inquiry?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. Although I wish to avoid the possibility of its being held as a precedent, I have no objection to this bill as now amended; but where a bill is reported by a committee and brought up in the House under suspension of the rules in violation of amended Rule XX and Rule XXI and the Chair sustains the point of order made from the floor, does not that wipe out the bill from consideration before the House?

The SPEAKER. The point of order was made only against the amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. But if it had been to the bill itself, the bill would have to go back to the committee, would it not?

The SPEAKER. Yes; if the point of order had been made in general terms. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I was going to ask my colleague if in the amendment in line 7 the word "and" and in the next line of the amendment the words "offer for sale" ought not to be stricken out, and the word "sell" substituted, so that it would read "reappraise and sell the segregated coal and asphalt deposits," and so forth?

Mr. CARTER. That would be a better conclusion, I think, than the bill as it is now.

Mr. Speaker, I move to amend by striking out, in lines 7 and 8, the words "offer for sale" and inserting the word "sell."

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The gentleman offers an amendment to his amendment, then?

Mr. CARTER. Yes.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I should like to know, just for curiosity, why, after due consideration, the gentleman from Oklahoma introduces a bill which provides that the Secretary is authorized to offer for sale, and then the Committee on Indian Affairs, after careful and exhaustive consideration of this subject, moves an amendment in which it uses the same language, and then when some gentleman on the floor facetiously suggests different language, the gentleman is perfectly willing to adopt it. Has the bill had no consideration at all?

Mr. CARTER. Yes; the gentleman will notice that the bill had some consideration, because it was amended by the committee.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I assumed that it had, although I do not think that is any proof of it.

Mr. CARTER. The gentleman from Illinois, of course, knows the difference between the words. It just simply brings the thing to a conclusion when we direct him to sell, whereas directing him to offer for sale does not.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. If the words "offer for sale" do not mean that the Secretary has the right to consummate the sale, then I do not understand the English language, as the gentleman did not when he introduced the bill, and the committee did not when it reported the bill.

Mr. CARTER. I think it is really the difference between tweedledee and tweedledum. I am not going to insist on it if the gentleman objects.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I wondered why the committee, having given careful consideration to the subject, should be so willing to switch on the floor.

Mr. CARTER. If the gentleman objects to it, I shall not insist on the amendment.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I shall not object.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. The vote, I take it, is on the amendment to the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair did not understand the gentleman to offer an amendment to the amendment.

Mr. CARTER. Yes; I offered an amendment to the amendment, but I said I would withdraw it if the gentleman from Illinois made any objection to it. He did not express any.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CARTER moves to amend the amendment by striking out the words "offer for sale" and insert in lieu thereof the word "sell."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as amended.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. CARTER, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

ARLINGTON MEMORIAL AMPHITHEATER.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 8032) to provide for the erection of memorials and the entombment of bodies in the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater, in Arlington National Cemetery, Virginia.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. I should like to have the bill reported.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That a commission is hereby created, to be composed of the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, which shall submit annually to the President, who shall transmit the same to Congress by the first Monday in December, recommendations as to what, if any, inscriptions, tablets, busts, or other memorials shall be erected, and what, if any, bodies of deceased members of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps shall be entombed during the next ensuing year within the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater, in the Arlington National Cemetery, Virginia: *Provided,* That no memorial shall be placed and no body shall be interred in the grounds about the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater within a distance of 250 feet from the said memorial.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of War shall be the chairman of the said commission and the officer in charge of public buildings and grounds in the District of Columbia shall be its executive and disbursing officer. The commission shall keep full and accurate records of all its proceedings and transactions in regard to proposed memorials submitted for its consideration, and is authorized to employ such assistants as may be necessary to enable it to discharge properly the duties imposed upon it.

SEC. 3. That no inscription, tablet, bust, or other memorial shall be erected nor shall any body be entombed within the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater unless specifically authorized in each case by act of the Congress. Applications for such authority shall be submitted in all cases through the commission created by this act.

SEC. 4. That no inscription, tablet, bust, or other memorial as herein provided for shall be erected to commemorate any person who shall not have rendered conspicuously distinguished service in the United States Army, Navy, or Marine Corps, nor shall the body of any such person be entombed in the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater; nor shall any such memorial be erected or any body be entombed therein within 10 years after the date of the death of the person so to be commemorated, unless specifically otherwise provided by act of Congress in individual cases.

SEC. 5. That the character, design, and location of any such inscriptions, tablets, busts, or other memorials when authorized as herein provided shall be subject to the approval of the commission herein created, which shall in each case obtain the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts.

SEC. 6. That the commission herein created is authorized to expend the sum of \$3,000, or as much thereof as may be necessary, to defray its expenses during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920.

SEC. 7. That all acts or parts of acts inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 10, after the word "officer," strike out the remainder of line 10 and all of lines 11 to 15, inclusive.

Page 2, line 19, after the word "Congress," strike out lines 20 and 21.

Page 3, line 12, strike out all of sections 6 and 7.

Mr. BLANTON. I reserve the right to object, Mr. Speaker. I should like to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill a question. Is there anyone here in charge of the bill? If not, I object to its consideration, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. I ask unanimous consent, in the absence of the author of the bill, that it may remain on the calendar.

Mr. BLANTON. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the bill will retain its place on the calendar.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

MEDICAL, SURGICAL, AND HOSPITAL SUPPLIES.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 14315) to authorize an appropriation to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to provide medical, surgical, and hospital services and supplies for patients of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance and of the Federal Board for Vocational Education, Division of Rehabilitation, suffering from neuro-psychiatric and tubercular ailments and diseases, and for other purposes.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, that is not the bill which was passed this morning, but is the bill for which the other one was a substitute, and that being the more liberal bill, we passed it. I think this bill ought to be stricken from the calendar. I suggest that it be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the bill will be laid on the table.

There was no objection.

SUPERINTENDENT OF THE FIVE CIVILIZED TRIBES.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 15159) changing the designation of the Superintendent for the Five Civilized Tribes to the Third Assistant Secretary of the Interior, defining his duties, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Reserving the right to object—

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, if we want to economize time, I feel that this is too important a measure to be considered on this calendar. I shall object eventually. I will reserve the objection if the gentleman from Washington wishes me to do so.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I have no desire to have the gentleman reserve his objection. I simply want to know how the Third Assistant Secretary of the Interior is to be appointed, and how this commissioner is appointed?

Mr. CRAMTON. Then, if the gentleman does not wish me to reserve the objection, I will object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made. The Clerk will report the next bill.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill remain on the calendar.

Mr. WALSH. But to go to the foot of the calendar?

Mr. HASTINGS. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent that the bill go to the foot of the calendar. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DISPOSITION OF ABANDONED LIGHTHOUSES AND LIFE-SAVING STATIONS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 8545) to provide for the disposition of abandoned lighthouses and life-saving stations.

The Clerk read the bill with the committee amendments.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. I object.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Will the gentleman reserve his objection? We have similar legislation in regard to abandoned military reservations.

Mr. WALSH. The lighthouses are under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Commerce, and I do not believe that we can give the Secretary of the Interior the right to sell lighthouse reservations and to determine whether they are needed.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. It only applies to those that have been abandoned.

Mr. WALSH. It says that those that are no longer needed. That does not mean necessarily that they are abandoned.

Mr. SEARS. Will the gentleman withhold his objection?

Mr. WALSH. I will reserve the objection.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Speaker, this bill in July, 1918, passed the Senate, and a favorable report was made by Mr. Vogelsang. This year it was reported by the Committee on Public Lands of

the House with a favorable report by Franklin K. Lane, Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Was this bill referred to the Secretary of Commerce?

Mr. SEARS. It was referred to the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. He would have the sale of the property, but that has nothing to do with this; what we want to know is whether the department that has jurisdiction over the property was consulted? This authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to sell any lighthouse stations in the United States.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. The Secretary of the Interior could not certify that they were not needed?

Mr. MANN of Illinois. He is the only one that could certify to it under this bill.

Mr. SEARS. When this bill was referred to the committee, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SINNOTT] being chairman, I requested that the bill be referred to the proper department and get a report, and that was done.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that line 3 of the bill, page 1, provides that where reservations of the public land for lighthouse or life-saving purposes are no longer needed for that purpose the Secretary of the Interior may, and so forth.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. "Are no longer needed." They are all public land?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. They are not public land.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. There is not a lighthouse in the United States that is on private land.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. No; the title is in the Government, in the Secretary—

Mr. MANN of Illinois. But we take it away from him. What I want to know is whether the bill had been referred to the Secretary of Commerce, who has jurisdiction over the Life-Saving Service?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I would like to ask the gentleman what is the process of complete abandonment of a lighthouse station? How is it made complete?

Mr. SEARS. The only station that I remember is where Congress ceased to make an appropriation; I tried to get them to revive it, but was not able to get my good friends to do it.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I think I will renew my objection.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

SURVEY OF PUBLIC LANDS IN FLORIDA.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 578) providing for the survey of public lands remaining unsurveyed in the State of Florida, with a view of satisfying the grant in aid of schools made to said State under the act of March 3, 1845, and other acts amendatory thereof.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc., That it shall be lawful for the properly credited agent or official of the State of Florida having in charge the adjustment of its school grant to apply to the Commissioner of the General Land Office for the survey of any townships or parts of townships of public land unsurveyed in any of the surveying districts of said State, with a view to satisfy the grant in aid of schools made to said State of Florida by the act of March 3, 1845, and other acts amendatory thereto to the extent of the full quantity of land called for thereby; and upon the application of said agent or official the Commissioner of the General Land Office shall proceed to have the survey or surveys so applied for made as in the case of surveys of other public lands; and the lands that may be found to fall within the limits of such townships or parts of townships as ascertained by the survey shall be reserved upon the filing of the application for survey from any adverse appropriation by settlement or otherwise, except under rights that may be found to exist of prior inception, for a period to extend from such application for survey until the expiration of 60 days from date of filing of the township plat of survey in the proper district land office, during which period of 60 days the State may select any of such lands not embraced in any valid adverse claim for the satisfaction of its school grant, as aforesaid, with the condition, however, that the agent or official of the State, within 30 days from the date of such filing of the application for survey, shall cause a notice to be published, which publication shall be continued for 30 days from date of first publication, in some newspaper of general circulation in the vicinity of the lands likely to be embraced in such townships or parts of townships giving notice to all parties interested of the fact of such application for survey and the exclusive right of selection by the State for the aforesaid period of 60 days, as herein provided for, and after the expiration of such 60 days any lands which may remain unselected by the State and not otherwise appropriated according to law shall be subject to disposal under general laws as other public lands: *Provided*, That the Commissioner of the General Land Office shall give notice immediately of the reservation of any township or parts of townships to the officials of the local land office of the land district in which the land is situated of the withdrawal of such townships or parts of townships for the purpose hereinbefore provided: *Provided further*, That the agent or official of the State of Florida hereinbefore mentioned is authorized to advance money from time to time for the survey of the township or townships, or part*

thereof withdrawn, at such United States depository as may be designated by the Commissioner of the General Land Office, and the money so advanced shall be reimbursable.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 3, line 17, after the word "reimbursable," insert: "*Provided further, That nothing herein shall be deemed to authorize the Commissioner of the General Land Office to survey any lands within the exterior boundaries of the Everglades, as defined in Everglades patent No. 137, issued to the State of Florida by the United States under the swamp land act of 1850.*"

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word, in order to ask the gentleman from Florida in charge of the bill what it is intended to accomplish under the second proviso on page 3. That second proviso is:

That the agent or official of the State of Florida hereinbefore mentioned is authorized to advance money from time to time for the survey of the township or townships, or part thereof withdrawn, at such United States depository as may be designated by the Commissioner of the General Land Office, and the money so advanced shall be reimbursable.

Mr. DRANE. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, that is the ordinary procedure. I may be mistaken about it, but my understanding is that when land is being surveyed in a given State the payment is immediately made for the expense of that by the United States Land Office out of its current funds, which in time are reimbursable from the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. WALSH. This permits the Florida official or agent to advance the money.

Mr. DRANE. The United States official in Florida, yes; to take it out of his current fund.

Mr. WALSH. But this says the agent or the official of the State of Florida.

Mr. DRANE. Not of the State of Florida.

Mr. WALSH. Here is what it says:

Provided further, That the agent or official of the State of Florida—And so forth.

Where does the reimbursement come from? From the Treasury of the United States?

Mr. DRANE. I understand now what the gentleman means. The bill may be incorrectly drawn in this, that at the time the bill was originally drawn—and I am only handling it for the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK], because he is absent—whoever drew the bill drew it with the idea that there was a surveyor general in the State of Florida. Since the report from the Secretary of the Interior called attention to the fact that in 1908 the office of the surveyor general was discontinued and the land business of the Government was put into the hands of the register of the land office, it may be that the language of the bill is faulty in that respect.

Mr. WALSH. Does not the gentleman think it should be amended?

Mr. DRANE. I do.

Mr. WALSH. Has the gentleman an amendment to offer?

Mr. DRANE. I have not, and I would be glad to have the gentleman offer one.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DRANE. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from Florida must have overlooked a bet in respect to his State, because he will remember that not long ago, on the recommendation of the Secretary, we sought to do away with, and did do away with temporarily, all of the surveyors general, and after we had put them out of the bill the distinguished gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] came in and had 13 of them put back into the bill. The gentleman should have had his put back into the bill at the same time, because the gentleman from Wyoming was looking out for Wyoming.

Mr. DRANE. We do not need one down there and have not for a good many years, and naturally would not want him if we did not need him.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, this bill is intended to correct the supposed errors of a survey made in 1911. As I understand it, there are now seven cases in the United States court, and they are trying to get a correct survey that they can go by.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, may I suggest to the gentleman from Massachusetts, if he will yield, that at most the language that he refers to is superfluous. It certainly can not do any harm. Evidently it was drawn, as the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DRANE] suggests, by some one who had in mind the old procedure for the survey of land, where application was made to the surveyor general under the old system. This survey would be made by the Commissioner of the General Land Office with his regular surveying force, and would be paid for out of the Federal Treasury, out of the surveying fund. It would not cost very much at most and it would do no harm if

the State of Florida saw fit to advance the money for the survey as provided here. No harm could come from the language of the bill, but under the present practice it is not necessary.

Mr. DRANE. My own impression was that the committee had drafted such amendments as had been suggested in the letter from the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of the General Land Office.

Mr. MONDELL. That is the language that would have been required at one time under the old practice covering all surveys.

Mr. WALSH. Oh, yes; but it is not required now, and we ought not to complicate legislation and possibly throw it open to uncertain interpretation in the future.

Mr. MONDELL. I think the gentleman from Florida would have no objection to striking it out.

Mr. DRANE. No; I have no objection whatever.

Mr. WALSH. I have no objection to the general purpose of the bill, but I do not think we ought to carry that language in there. I move to amend the bill, Mr. Speaker, by striking out—page 3, line 11—all after the word "provided," where it first occurs in the line, down to and including the word "reimbursable," in line 17.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 11, after the word "provided," where it occurs the first time, strike out the remainder of the paragraph, down to and including the word "reimbursable," in line 17.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it now, this will not in any way hamper the surveys or the carrying on of the activity of the department, and that there is money available here under which those surveys can be made. Under the operations of the general land law the agent of the Land Office can make the survey and pay for it, and then it will be reimbursable under the general fund.

Mr. DRANE. That is what was suggested in a very long report here.

Mr. WALSH. That is the understanding I had of the matter.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the Philippine question.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I shall have to object to that.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington objects.

Mr. KING. I waited a long time to get this in.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The question was taken, and the committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. McLEOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks made to-day. Is there objection?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry, but I shall have to object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington objects.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill H. R. 8545 retain its place on the calendar.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent that the bill referred to retain its place on the calendar. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. If the gentleman will ask that it go to the foot of the calendar I shall not object, but I do object to its retaining its place on the calendar.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Speaker, I realize the congested condition and also the hopelessness of ever reaching it if it goes to the foot, because of the inability of the majority to work smoothly, so I do not care whether it stays on or not.

AMENDMENT OF THE SEAMEN'S ACT OF 1915.

The next business on the Unanimous Consent Calendar was the bill (H. R. 12396) to amend an act entitled "An act to promote the welfare of American seamen in the merchant marine of the United States; to abolish arrest and imprisonment as a penalty for desertion and to secure the abrogation of treaty provisions in relation thereto; and to promote safety at sea," approved March 4, 1915.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill of such tremendous importance that I think it should not come up in this way, and I object.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the gentleman withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. BLANTON. I will; but I intend to object later.

Mr. SCOTT. I hope the gentleman will not make that as a positive statement, because the gentleman will recall that last year—

Mr. BLANTON. Just one minute. The gentleman knows that it is important—

Mr. SCOTT. It is very important. It will not take any time at all, because I hope there will not be any objection, if the gentleman will hear me.

Mr. BLANTON. We are used to passing \$340,000,000 bills in 40 minutes.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the gentleman indulge me to make a statement?

Mr. BLANTON. I would if there were not other men who are waiting to get bills up.

Mr. MONDELL. Will not the gentleman from Texas give the gentleman from Michigan a couple of minutes to explain the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. I will reserve it a few minutes.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I will preface my remarks by saying that I have been in Congress six years, and this is the first time I have had a bill on the Unanimous Consent Calendar. I am confident that if this bill is understood it will not have opposition. It is of vital importance to the people who live in Michigan, and in consequence of its importance I have presumed to put it on the Unanimous Consent Calendar and also on the House Calendar in the hope that I might obtain its consideration and disposition at this session of the Congress.

I called your attention to this same measure nearly a year ago in the conference report on the shipping bill. Here is the situation: Under the law as it now stands the passenger boats are only allowed credit for the lifeboats and life rafts that they carry. In other words, during the summer they are compelled to carry life rafts and boats sufficient to accommodate 50 per cent of the passengers. Our ships run 3 miles from shore and can get to shore in 15 minutes. Before the 15th of May and after the 15th of September they are obliged to carry life boats and rafts sufficient to accommodate everybody on board. That is humanly impossible if the ship carries passengers above 50 per cent of its actual carrying capacity before May 15 or after September 15.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman says that the boats go only 3 miles from shore. Does not the gentleman remember that a picnic boat capsized close to a bank and that the whole bunch of children, hundreds of them, were drowned?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes; I remember that very regrettable incident. But if they had had 5,000 lifeboats on that ship they could not have saved them. The passenger ships have always and now carry life-saving appliances, life belts, suits, and other life-saving devices, more than sufficient to accommodate everybody on board. The operation of the present law precludes the people who live in northern Michigan from traveling on the boats that run up there, and the result is that the ships that run up Lake Huron are for the benefit of the summer tourists, and we who live there are penalized because we live in Michigan.

Unless we get the permission that will enable passenger ships to carry a reasonable number of passengers from May 1 to October 15, our people will not be able to travel on the boats in the spring or fall. I thought if the situation was understood by the House there would be no opposition. The committee of which I am a member has reported this bill three times unanimously.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] that I trust he will not object to the consideration of this bill. The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries gave it very careful and mature consideration, and it is a most meritorious measure, and very important to the shipping interest that the gentleman from Michigan has testified about.

Mr. BLANTON. I am open to conviction, but I would like to ask the gentleman from Alabama if the committee gave this as much serious consideration as they did the House resolution a while ago that sought to retain war-time camps in peace times?

Mr. SCOTT. That is not the same committee.

Mr. BANKHEAD. We had nothing to do with that.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to know if your committee gave this careful consideration?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. And the gentleman has investigated the matter and indorses the bill?

Mr. BANKHEAD. I absolutely did so, or I would not indorse the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That an act entitled "An act to promote the welfare of American seamen in the merchant marine of the United States; to abolish arrest and imprisonment as a penalty for desertion and to secure the abrogation of treaty provisions in relation thereto; and to promote safety at sea," approved March 4, 1915, be, and the same is hereby, amended as follows:

"SEC. 2a. That in all merchant vessels of the United States of more than 100 tons gross operating on the Great Lakes where the trip run is eight hours or less, excepting those navigating rivers, harbors, bays, or sounds exclusively, the provisions of section 2 of this act shall not apply except that at all times nine hours shall constitute a day's work: *Provided*, That in all merchant vessels of the United States of more than 100 tons gross operating on the Great Lakes where the trip run is more than 8 hours and less than 16 hours, except those navigating rivers, harbors, bays, or sounds exclusively, the sailors, officers, water-tenders, and firemen shall be divided into at least two watches, which shall be kept on duty successively for the performance of ordinary work incident to the sailing and management of the vessel.

"SEC. 13a. That on the Great Lakes, if able seamen are not obtainable, certificated lifeboat men may be used in lieu thereof in a number not to exceed 25 per cent of the deck crew.

"SEC. 14a. That on the Great Lakes the requirements set forth in section 14 of this act shall be applicable during the intervals from May 1 to October 15, inclusive, instead of from May 15 to September 15, inclusive, and from October 15 to May 1 instead of from September 15 to May 15, respectively, as provided in section 14."

Also the following committee amendment was read:

Page 2, strike out all of section 2a and section 13a.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The question being on the engrossment and third reading of the bill, the bill was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. SCOTT, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

APPLICATION OF RECLAMATION LAW TO IRRIGATION DISTRICTS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 2702) to provide for the application of the reclamation law to irrigation districts.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, with the general purpose of this bill I think I am quite in harmony, but after quite a lengthy and careful study given to the proviso amendment on page 4, I have been unable to follow the language of the amendment. I think it is entirely too complicated and involved for the House to understand in the time remaining to-day, and I think I will simply conserve the time of the House by objecting now.

Mr. RAKER. I hope the gentleman will not do that.

Mr. CRAMTON. Well, I think nobody can read that language on page 4 and be sure of what they are getting at. I have given it mature consideration.

Mr. RAKER. I would like the gentleman to reserve his objection.

Mr. WALSH. If the gentleman from Michigan is going to yield to the blandishments of the gentleman from California, I shall have to object.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may go to the foot of the calendar.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that the bill go to the foot of the calendar. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California makes the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman is hurting his own side.

Mr. GARNER. I can not help it.

Mr. RAKER. You can help it by at least giving a man a chance to explain a decent bill.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I did not object. I simply said that since the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] was inclined to withdraw his objection I would reserve mine.

Mr. RAKER. For many days and weeks I have made no objection.

Mr. WALSH. I was simply saying to the gentleman from California that I did not want to interpose my objection to pre-

vent his answering the suggestion of the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I make this suggestion to the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER], who is generally very reasonable, and to all other gentlemen: That if an objection is going to be made to a bill, there is no use in taking time in discussing it, because there are other bills on the calendar in which many gentlemen are interested.

Mr. RAKER. I have confidence in the Members of the House that when convincing facts are presented a man who is undertaking to make objection will not object.

Mr. MONDELL. But when the gentleman has been informed that somebody is going to object, he should not make a point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. RAKER. I was just saying that—

Mr. WALSH. Well, I guess I shall object.

Mr. MONDELL. I had hoped, Mr. Speaker, that we could run on until 6 o'clock and that we could pass some of these bills.

Mr. RAKER. Every time the other fellow's bill gets through and mine does not, and under the circumstances, while it is not right—

Mr. ANDERSON. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RAKER. Do not be too hurried. I will withdraw the point of order under the circumstances.

The SPEAKER. The point of order that there is no quorum present is withdrawn. The Clerk will report the next bill.

POST-OFFICE SITE, SPRING VALLEY, ILL.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 2328) relating to the title to land to be acquired as a site for a post-office building at Spring Valley, Ill. The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I reported that bill for the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. IRELAND], who is present, and he would like to make an explanation of it.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, may I ask unanimous consent that the report on the bill be read? It is short. It will take up less time of the House and serve as a preface to my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Objection is reserved.

Mr. IRELAND. Let me just briefly explain that this bill is designed to grant authority to enable the Government, through the Treasury Department, to accept title to land for a post-office site for which an appropriation was made in the Sixty-third Congress, with coal reservations. I introduced this bill in the Sixty-fifth Congress and again in the Sixty-sixth Congress, and I have been advised by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] then chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. LANGLEY], the present chairman of that committee, that this custom has often been followed, especially in the State of Pennsylvania, where many coal rights are reserved.

Now, for the purposes intended it is of no advantage for the Government to retain those coal rights, and at the suggestion of the Secretary of the Treasury—

Mr. BLANTON. Does it appropriate any more money?

Mr. IRELAND. No, indeed, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. Will it cause any more money to be appropriated?

Mr. IRELAND. Not a dime.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized, in his discretion, in the acquisition, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, of a suitable site for a post office at Spring Valley, Ill., pursuant to authority granted by the public building act, approved March 4, 1913 (37 Stat. L., 62d Cong., 3d sess., p. 877), to accept title to land reserving or excepting all ores or minerals on or in such lands, with the rights of mining the same.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. IRELAND, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the bill. Is there objection?

Mr. McCLINTIC. I object.

PENSIONS FOR STATE MILITIA IN THE CIVIL WAR.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 13312) to extend the provisions of the pension act of May 11, 1912, to the officers and enlisted men of all State

militia and other State organizations that rendered service to the Union cause during the Civil War for a period of 90 days or more, and providing pensions for their widows, minor children, and dependent parents, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, I do not think this bill ought to pass under the circumstances that exist to-night, and I object.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I realize that the gentleman from Texas correctly states the situation, that we could not pass the bill to-night, and while I deeply regret it, I ask unanimous consent, with a view to advancing the parliamentary status of the bill, that it be rereferred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that the bill be rereferred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

BRIDGE ACROSS MISSISSIPPI RIVER, ST. PAUL, MINN.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 13606) granting the consent of Congress to the city of St. Paul, Minn., to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the city of St. Paul, Minn., and its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Mississippi River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near the point where Sibley Street, in said city of St. Paul, crosses the Mississippi River in the county of Ramsey, in the State of Minnesota, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. KELLER, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS SANTEE RIVER IN SOUTH CAROLINA.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 15015) to authorize the building of a bridge across the Santee River in South Carolina.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. STOLL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate bill, S. 4049, on the Speaker's table, be substituted for the House bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that the Senate bill on the Speaker's table be substituted for the House bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate bill.

The bill, S. 4949, was read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the State highway department of South Carolina and the Santee River Bridge Commission be, and they are hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Santee River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation and at or near a point known as Murray's Ferry, between the counties of Berkeley and Williamsburg, S. C., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. STOLL, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

On motion of Mr. STOLL, by unanimous consent, H. R. 15015 was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE PEEDEE RIVER IN SOUTH CAROLINA.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 15016) to authorize the building of a bridge across the Pee Dee River in South Carolina.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. STOLL. I ask that the Senate bill, S. 4950, on the Speaker's table, be substituted for the House bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina asks unanimous consent that the Senate bill on the Speaker's table be substituted for the House bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate bill.

The bill (S. 4950) was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the State Highway Department of South Carolina and the Peedee Bridge Commission be, and they are hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Peedee River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, and at or near a point known as Mars Bluff Ferry, between the counties of Florence and Marion, in the State of South Carolina, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. STOLL, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

On motion of Mr. STOLL, by unanimous consent, H. R. 15016 was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS WATEREE RIVER IN SOUTH CAROLINA.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 15017) to authorize the building of a bridge across the Waterree River in South Carolina.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate bill on the Speaker's table be substituted for the House bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent that the Senate bill be considered in lieu of the House bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate bill.

The bill (S. 4951) was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the State Highway Department of South Carolina and the properly constituted authorities of Richland and Sumter Counties of that State be, and they are hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Waterree River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, and at or near a point known as Gerners Ferry, between the counties of Sumter and Richland, in the State of South Carolina, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. MONTAGUE, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

On motion of Mr. MONTAGUE, by unanimous consent, H. R. 15017 was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I desire to withdraw the objection I made to the extension of remarks by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLEOD] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KING].

Mr. SEARS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I will couple with that a request for unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the Miami Chamber of Commerce in reference to Miami Harbor.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will put all three requests together. Is there objection to the extension of remarks by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KING], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLEOD], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SEARS]?

There was no objection.

BRIDGE OVER THE WITHLACOOCHIEE RIVER.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 4587) granting the consent of Congress to the counties of Brooks and Lowndes, in the State of Georgia, to construct a bridge over the Withlacoochee River.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the counties of Brooks and Lowndes, in the State of Georgia, and their successors and assigns, to construct or rebuild, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Withlacoochee River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation at or near Ousley, Ga., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. ESCH, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, there are six bridge bills on the calendar, and I ask unanimous consent that we take up those bills. I imagine that there is no objection to them, and if after passing them we can go further, well and good, but I think the bridge bills ought to pass.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent that the remaining bridge bills be taken up irrespective of their place on the calendar. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE HUDSON RIVER.

The next business taken up on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 15131) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Hudson River between the city of Troy, in the county of Rensselaer and the city of Cohoes, in the county of Albany, in the State of New York.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the State of New York, the cities of Troy and Cohoes and the counties of Rensselaer and Albany, their successors and assigns, be, and are hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Hudson River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation between the city of Troy, in the county of Rensselaer, and the city of Cohoes, in the county of Albany, in the State of New York, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. PARKER, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE TUG RIVER, MINGO COUNTY, W. VA.

The next business taken up on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 15271) granting the consent of Congress to authorize the Majestic Collieries Co. to construct a bridge across the Tug River at or near Cedar, in Mingo County, W. Va., to the Kentucky side, in Pike County, Ky.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Majestic Collieries Co., of Majestic, Ky., and its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Tug River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Cedar, the county of Mingo, State of West Virginia, to the Kentucky side, in the county of Pike, in the State of Kentucky, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The following committee amendment was read:

Page 1, line 6, after the word "Tug," insert "Fork of Big Sandy."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill granting the consent of Congress to authorize the Majestic Collieries Co. to construct a bridge across the Tug Fork of Big Sandy River, at or near Cedar, in Mingo County, W. Va., to the Kentucky side, in Pike County, Ky."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest that the word "authorize" in the title should be stricken out. I think it should be a bill granting the consent of Congress to construct the bridge.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the title will be amended in accordance with the suggestion of the gentleman.

There was no objection.

The amended title was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. FIELDS, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE NEWARK BAY, STATE OF NEW JERSEY.

The next business taken up on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 4515) to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the navigable waters of the Newark Bay, in the State of New Jersey.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge authorized by act of Congress approved August 8, 1919, to be built by the Central Railroad Co. of New Jersey across the Newark Bay between the city of Elizabeth and the city of Bayonne, N. J., are hereby extended two and five years, respectively, from the date of approval of this act.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read the third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. ACKERMAN, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS NORTH BRANCH OF SUSQUEHANNA RIVER, PA.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was joint resolution (S. J. Res. 186) to extend the authority of the county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to construct a bridge across the North Branch of the Susquehanna River from the city of Wilkes-Barre, county of Luzerne, Pa., to the borough of Dorranceton, county of Luzerne, Pa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the authority granted in the act of Congress approved September 7, 1916, entitled "An act to authorize the county of Luzerne, State of Pennsylvania, to construct a bridge across the North Branch of the Susquehanna River from the city of Wilkes-Barre, county of Luzerne, Pa., to the borough of Dorranceton, county of Luzerne, Pa." is hereby renewed and extended to permit the commencement of the construction of said bridge within one year, and its completion within three years, from the date of the passage of this resolution, as provided under section 6 of the act of Congress approved March 23, 1906, being an act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, after line 6, insert as a new section the following:

"Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

BRIDGE ACROSS LAKE ST. CROIX, WIS. AND MINN.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 15418) authorizing the Prescott Bridge Co. to construct a bridge across Lake St. Croix at or near the city of Prescott in the State of Wisconsin.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute for this bill S. 4737, an identical bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is it the purpose to conclude the session when we finish the consideration of the bridge bills?

Mr. MONDELL. It is my impression that the House would be inclined to have an adjournment motion made at that time, after we get through with the bridge bills.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Some of us have been waiting here to get certain measures taken up, but if that is the intention we do not want to wait here any longer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to substitute Senate bill 4737 for this bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That authority is hereby granted to the Prescott Bridge Co., a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Wisconsin, and its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across Lake St. Croix at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near the city of Prescott, in the county of Pierce and State of Wisconsin, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill H. R. 15418 lie on the table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

On motion of Mr. ESCH, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS SUSQUEHANNA RIVER AT HARRISBURG, PA.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 4541) to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Susquehanna River at Harrisburg, Pa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk reported the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the reconstruction of a bridge authorized by act of Congress approved October 19, 1918, to be reconstructed by the Philadelphia, Harrisburg & Pittsburgh Railroad Co., its lessees, successors, and assigns, across the Susquehanna River at or about 4,250 feet west of Philadelphia, Harrisburg, and Pittsburgh Junction, Harrisburg, Pa., to a point in the borough of Lemoyne, Cumberland County, State of Pennsylvania, in accordance with act of Congress approved March 23, 1906, are hereby extended one and three years, respectively, from the date of approval of this act.

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

BRIDGE ACROSS HEADWATERS OF MOBILE BAY, ALA.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 4603) to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act to authorize the Gulf Ports Terminal Railway Co., a corporation existing under the laws of the State of Florida, to construct a bridge over and across the headwaters of Mobile Bay and such navigable channels as are between the east side of the bay and Blakely Island, in Baldwin and Mobile Counties, Ala.," approved October 5, 1917.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk reported the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act approved October 5, 1917, authorizing the Gulf Ports Terminal Railway Co., a corporation existing under the laws of the State of Florida, to construct, operate, and maintain a bridge or bridges and trestles over and across the navigable channels of the mouth of Mobile River from Bay Port, in township 4 south, range 2 east, on the east shore of the waters of Mobile Bay, in Baldwin County, Ala., on a direct line, to a point on Blakely Island, in Mobile County, on the east shore of Mobile River, opposite the municipal docks of the city of Mobile, Ala., at a point or points suitable to the interests of navigation, be, and the same is hereby, revived and reenacted: *Provided*, That this act shall be null and void unless the actual construction of the bridge, or bridges and trestles herein authorized, be commenced within one year and completed within three years from the date of approval hereof.

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. ESCH, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS LITTLE CALUMET RIVER, ILL.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 15750) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Little Calumet River, in Cook County, State of Illinois, at or near the village of Burnham, in said county.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object, and I do not intend to do so, but the next bill on the calendar is what is known as the Sheppard-Towner maternity bill, to protect the mothers and children of the country.

Mr. MANN of Illinois. That is not the next bill on the calendar. That is not a bridge bill.

Mr. BLANTON. I understand, but I want to ask the gentleman from Wyoming—if we do not pass this Sheppard-Towner bill in this session, the legislatures of the various States will not be in a position to meet the requirements of that act, and it would become noneffective in most States.

I want to ask the distinguished gentleman from Wyoming whether or not it is his intention after we take up these important bridge bills and pass them to give us a chance to pass that bill?

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing before the House to talk on, and I ask for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the county of Cook, a civil division of the State incorporated and organized under the laws of the State of Illinois, its successors and assigns, be, and they are hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Little Calumet River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near the village of Burnham, in Cook County, Ill., in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. MANN of Illinois, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE DELAWARE RIVER.

The next business on the Unanimous Consent Calendar was the bill (S. 4787) granting consent for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a bridge across the Delaware River from the city of Philadelphia, Pa., to the city of Camden, N. J.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Delaware River Bridge Joint Commission, acting in behalf of the States of Pennsylvania and New Jersey and the city of Philadelphia, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Delaware River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation at or between Green Street and South Street in Philadelphia, Pa., and points approximately opposite in Camden, N. J., in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. DARROW, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

BRIDGE OVER THE RIO GRANDE RIVER.

The next business in order on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 15769) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Rio Grande River, between the cities of Del Rio, Tex., and Las Vacas, Mexico.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Del Rio and Las Vacas Bridge Co., a corporation organized and created under and by virtue of the laws of the State of Texas, be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to construct, own, maintain, and operate a street railway bridge over the Rio Grande River between the cities of Del Rio, Tex., and Las Vacas, Mexico, at such point as may be most convenient to said corporation, and to build and lay on and across said bridge ways for the passage of animals, foot passengers, and vehicles of all kinds, for the transit of which said corporation may charge a reasonable toll, which charge shall be subject to a reasonable revision and regulation, from time to time, by the Secretary of War.

Sec. 2. That said bridge shall be built of good substantial materials, and of such strength and dimensions as may be sufficient to render the passage of all such vehicles, animals, and persons, as are herein mentioned, perfectly safe at any and all times.

Sec. 3. That Congress reserves the right to withdraw the authority and power conferred by this act in case the free navigation of said river shall at any time be substantially or materially obstructed by said bridge, or for any other reason, and to direct the removal or necessary modifications thereof at the cost and expense of the owners of said bridge; and Congress may, at any time, alter, repeal, or amend this act. The right is reserved to the United States for the establishment of a postal telegraph across the bridge.

Sec. 4. That the consent of the proper authorities of the Republic of Mexico shall have been obtained before said bridge shall be built or commenced.

The committee amendments were read, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out the word "own," and at the end of the line strike out the words "street railway."

Mr. MANN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask that all the committee amendments be reported at once.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. PARKER. Reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I want to ask the gentleman from Texas a question. This bridge is on the international line, and the same rules and regulations provided for the bridge at El Paso will be enforced at this bridge?

Mr. HUDSPETH. Yes; the same rules and regulations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois that all amendments be read at once? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 7, after the word "bridge," insert the words "and approaches thereto," and strike out the word "River."

Page 1, line 8, strike out the word "such" and insert "a."

Page 1, line 9, after the word "point" strike out the balance of the paragraph and insert in lieu thereof the words "suitable to the interests of navigation, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled 'An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters,' approved March 23, 1906."

Page 2, strike out all of sections 2 and 3.

Page 2, renumber section 4 to read "Sec. 2." Add section 3, to read as follows:

"Sec. 3. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved."

Line 2 of the title strike out the word "River."

The question was taken, and the amendments were agreed to. The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "To authorize the construction of a bridge over the Rio Grande, between the cities of Del Rio, Tex., and Las Vacas, Mexico."

On motion of Mr. HUDSPETH, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS COLUMBIA RIVER, OREG. AND WASH.

The next business in order on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 4825) to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Columbia River between the States of Oregon and Washington at or within 2 miles westerly from Cascade Locks in the State of Oregon.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WALSH. Reserving the right to object, what is the calendar number?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. It is House Calendar 284; it is a Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge and approaches thereto across the Columbia River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation at or near a point within 2 miles westerly from Cascade Locks, in the county of Hood River, State of Oregon, authorized by the act of Congress approved February 3, 1920, are hereby extended one and three years, respectively, from the date of approval hereof.

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. JOHNSON of Washington, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE HUDSON RIVER IN THE STATE OF NEW YORK.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take up the bill S. 4886, which is identical with House bill 15949. It is a bridge bill, and it is not on the Unanimous Consent Calendar. It is on the House Calendar. It is exactly in the same position—

Mr. BLANTON. Is it on the Speaker's table?

Mr. PARKER. It is on the Speaker's table. I ask that that bill be substituted for the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the time for the completion of the bridge of the Hudson River Connecting Railroad Corporation, under the provisions of the acts approved, respectively, March 13, 1914, and August 9, 1916, be extended to the 13th day of March, 1922.

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. PARKER, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Also, by motion of Mr. PARKER, a similar House bill, H. R. 15949, was ordered to lie on the table.

MATERNITY BILL.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take up the bill S. 3259, the Sheppard-Towner maternity bill. It is the bill of next importance on the calendar.

Mr. MERRITT. I ask that the calendar be read in the regular order now, Mr. Speaker.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. LARSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia moves that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. LARSEN. Division, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 7, noes 32.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum in order to get a new shift.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas makes the point that there is no quorum present. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until Tuesday, February 8, 1921, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

402. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a list of 90 leases granted by the Secretary of War under authority of the act of Congress approved July 28, 1892, during the calendar year 1920; to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department.

403. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting from the Chief of Engineers fourth report under section 10, act of March 2, 1919, as to river and harbor contracts that have become inequitable and unjust; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

404. A letter from the Comptroller of the Currency, transmitting volume 1 of the text of the annual report of the Comptroller of the Currency for the fiscal year ending October 31, 1920; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

405. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting statement in connection with authorization for outfits on first enlistment in the Navy; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. HUSTED, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 15977) authorizing suits against the United States in admiralty for collisions caused by and salvage services rendered to public vessels belonging to the United States, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 1301), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUTLER: A bill (H. R. 16040) to provide for the transfer of the naval seaplane known and designated as NC-4 to the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 16041) to amend the transportation act, 1920; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PELL: A bill (H. R. 16042) to exempt the President and Vice President of the United States from income tax on money received from the Treasury of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DYER: A bill (H. R. 16043) to authorize the incorporation of companies to promote trade in China; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VOLK: Resolution (H. Res. 671) requesting that the Secretary of the Treasury submit to the House of Representatives certain information regarding the loan by the War Finance Corporation to the Brooklyn Rapid Transit Co.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUTLER: Resolution (H. Res. 672) for the immediate consideration of House bill 15994; to the Committee on Rules.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, urging the passage of House bill 13558, providing for the establishment of 14 regional offices of the War Risk Bureau and as many suboffices as deemed necessary; authorizing the Post Office Department to collect premiums on Government insurance; and relieving from payment of premiums all disabled men in receipt of hospitalization after discharge from military service. Also urging the passage of House bills 10835, 14315, and 14557, and Senate bill 4357; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, favoring the calling by the President of the United States of the principal nations of the earth into a conference to discuss plans for an international disarmament; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HERSEY: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, favoring Federal aid for highway improvement; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. MCARTHUR: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Oregon, asking aid from the Federal Government in fighting the insect depredations in the timbered areas other than those owned by the Government; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Oregon, asking the assignment of a chemist and an animal pathologist

for the Oregon Agricultural College; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PETERS: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, urging the prompt passage by Congress of the McArthur bill, providing for continuance of Federal aid for public highway improvement; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, protesting against duty on lumber; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRUMBAUGH: A bill (H. R. 16044) for the relief of Joseph Maier; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 16045) to authorize the appointment of an ordnance storekeeper in the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'CONNOR: A bill (H. R. 16046) for the relief of Alfred Gregory Lee; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON: A bill (H. R. 16047) granting a pension to John E. Evans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5536. By Mr. BARBOUR: Petition of Maderia (Calif.) Branch No. 43, American Association for the Recognition of the Irish Republic, regarding treatment of American sailors in Cork, Ireland, and the debt of the British Government to the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5537. Also, petition of Placer County (Calif.) Farm Bureau, regarding a tariff on dried and canned fruits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5538. By Mr. CANNON: Petition of citizens of Illinois praying for an amendment of the Volstead law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5539. By Mr. CARSS: Petition of Josephine Widener, 311 East Fifty-eighth Street, New York City, regarding the Britten resolution (H. J. Res. 433); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5540. Also, petition of H. J. Werden, 311 East Fifty-eighth Street, New York City, and Joseph J. Albrecht, favoring the Britten resolution (H. J. Res. 433); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5541. Also, petition of Buffalo Brake Beam Co., Buffalo, N. Y., favoring the Winslow bill (H. R. 15836); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5542. By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Henry G. Bubeck and 35 others, of La Salle, Ill., favoring an amendment to the Volstead Act to permit the manufacture and sale of beer and light wines, and opposing the Sunday blue laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5543. Also, petition of the International Association of Machinists, Washington, D. C., favoring an amendment to the Army appropriation bill against the Taylor system of scientific management; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5544. Also, petition of Hupp & Sowers, of Streator, Ill., favoring a 1 per cent tax on sales; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5545. By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of representatives of the Farm Bureau Federations of Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Iowa, Missouri, South Dakota, Kansas, and Nebraska, urging the need of an appropriation of sufficient volume to carry on the work of collecting and disseminating statistical information vital to the farmer, breeder, and feeder; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5546. Also (by request), petition of a meeting of the unemployed of Oklahoma City, Okla., urging a resumption of trade with soviet Russia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5547. Also (by request), petition of certain employees of the Steamboat-Inspection Service, favoring House bill 15746; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

5548. Also (by request), petition of Council of the City of Cleveland, Ohio, requesting the immediate recognition of the republic of Ireland by the United States of America; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5549. By Mr. JOHNSTON of New York: Petition of Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, favoring simplification of suits in admiralty against the United States Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5550. Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, regarding further restrictions on traffic in narcotic drugs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5551. By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: Petition of Bring Home the Soldier-Dead League, McKeesport, Pa., Pittsburgh district, opposing any legislation in favor of the Fish resolution, and favoring the return to America of the bodies of all American soldiers, sailors, and marines who died on foreign soil; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5552. By Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa: Petition of De La Salle Council, No. 619, Knights of Columbus, Keokuk, Iowa, opposing the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5553. By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Petition of members of Rhode Island District No. 10, Irish National Foresters, protesting against the deportation of Lord Mayor O'Callaghan, of Cork, Ireland, from the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

5554. By Mr. LAMPERT: Petition from citizens of Reedsville, Wis., protesting against the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5555. Also, petition of voters of Neenah, Wis., requesting an amendment to the Volstead Act permitting the manufacture and sale of beer and light wines; also protesting against the so-called Sunday blue laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5556. Also, petition of citizens of Menasha, Wis., requesting amendment to the Volstead Act, permitting the manufacture and sale of beer and light wines; also protesting against the so-called Sunday blue-law legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5557. By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan: Petition of residents of Suttons Bay, Mich., protesting against the occupation of Germany by French Negro troops; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5558. By Mr. MADDEN: Petition of sundry citizens of Chicago, Ill., favoring beer and light wines and opposing the Sunday blue laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5559. By Mr. NEWTON of Minnesota: Resolution by the Minnesota State Legislature, urging the United States Congress to refrain from placing a duty on lumber imported from the Dominion of Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5560. Also, resolution of the Northwestern Lumbermen's Association, opposing and protesting against placing a duty on lumber imported from Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5561. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, favoring simplification of suits in admiralty against the United States Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5562. Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, advocating further restrictions on traffic in narcotic drugs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5563. By Mr. PETERS: Petition of Mrs. William G. Ellis and 18 others, of Gardiner, Me., opposing the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5564. By Mr. SNYDER: Petition of various clergymen and laymen resident in the thirty-third district of New York, opposing the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5565. By Mr. STINESS: Petition of Catholic Club of Providence, R. I., protesting against the passage of the Smith-Towner bill; to the Committee on Education.

5566. By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of Massachusetts Federation of Churches, Boston, Mass., favoring world disarmament and no increased appropriation for armament; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5567. Also, petition of members of Charles Stewart Parnell Council of the American Association for the Recognition of the Irish Republic, protesting against the deportation of Lord Mayor O'Callaghan; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

5568. By Mr. YATES: Petition of Julius Kespohl, of Quincy, Ill., protesting against the reduction of appropriation for encouraging of horse breeding to \$100,000; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5569. Also, petition of Woman's Home Missionary Society, Methodist Episcopal Church, Sycamore, Ill., by Mrs. Frank Millet, temperance secretary, favoring the Sheppard-Towner bill and similar legislation; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5570. Also, petition of Free Sewing Machine Co., Rockford, Ill., by Mr. V. M. Johnson, general manager, proposing as an emergency measure that the Payne-Aldrich tariff of 1909 be substituted for the Underwood Act of 1913; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5571. Also, petition of Illinois Manufacturers' Association, Chicago, by Mr. G. R. Meyercord, president, urging a larger appropriation than \$567,760 for the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5572. Also, petition of Rev. Unar Blough, pastor Church of the Brethren, Pleasant Mound, Ill., favoring the Fess-Capper bill (H. R. 12652); to the Committee on Education.

5573. Also, petition of the Whig Journal, Quincy, Ill., by A. O. Lindsay, asking at least \$2,000,000 as an appropriation for the development and use of the upper Mississippi River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

5574. Also, petition of Tonk Manufacturing Co., Chicago, urging the passage of the Winslow measure; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5575. Also, petition of Johnson Bros. Coal Co., Chicago, protesting against Senate bill 4828; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5576. By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petition of Towner Post, No. 34, American Legion, of Towner, N. Dak.; Johnson-Melary Post, No. 115, American Legion, of Hettinger, N. Dak.; and Raymond B. Thorne Post, No. 30, American Legion, of New Rockford, N. Dak., favoring legislation to provide better hospital facilities for disabled war veterans, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5577. By Mr. ZIHLMAN: Petition of Baltimore Chapter of the American Officers of the Great War, opposing the Army reorganization bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5578. Also, petition of the Rotary Club of Baltimore, Md., favoring a "turnover tax"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

* TUESDAY, February 8, 1921.

(Legislative day of Saturday, February 5, 1921.)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The reading clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Harrison	McNary	Smith, S. C.
Brandagee	Heflin	Nelson	Smoot
Capper	Jones, Wash.	New	Townsend
Dial	Kellogg	Overman	Trammell
Dillingham	Kendrick	Ransdell	Walsh, Mass.
Fernald	Kenyon	Reed	Warren
Gay	King	Robinson	Williams
Glass	La Follette	Sheppard	Willis
Gooding	Lenroot	Simmons	
Gronna	McKellar	Smith, Ariz.	
Harris	McLean	Smith, Ga.	

Mr. SMOOT. I was requested to announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PAGE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER], the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. KEYES], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BALL], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] are engaged in a hearing before the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-one Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present. The roll of absentees will be called.

The reading clerk called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. CURTIS answered to his name when called.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland, Mr. McCORMICK, Mr. BALL, Mr. POINDEXTER, Mr. HALE, Mr. KEYES, Mr. FRANCE, Mr. COLT, Mr. WOLCOTT, Mr. SPENCER, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. WADSWORTH, Mr. McCUMBER, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. HITCHCOCK, Mr. SWANSON, Mr. PITTMAN, and Mr. BORAH entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed without amendment bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 4515. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the navigable waters of the Newark Bay, in the State of New Jersey;

S. 4541. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Susquehanna River at Harrisburg, Pa.;

S. 4587. Granting the consent of Congress to the counties of Brooks and Lowndes, in the State of Georgia, to construct a bridge over the Withlacoochee River;

S. 4603. An act to revive and reenact the act entitled "An act to authorize the Gulf Ports Terminal Railway Co., a corpora-